



[illegible]

FEB 2 '83

WFL FEB 7 - '83

FEB 7 - 80

SEP 23 '85

MAIN LIBRARY

923.141 H383R 440885



923.141 H383R

440885

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1223 00617 5591



*From the picture by H. RIGAUD. By permission
of the EARL OF ROSEBURY, K.G.]*

JAMES FRANCIS EDWARD (JAMES III. AND VIII.)

The Royal Stewarts

BY

T. F. HENDERSON

WITH PORTRAITS

William Blackwood and Sons
Edinburgh and London

1914

923.141
H383^u
440885

3 1223 00617 5591

PREFACE.

THE following pages are occupied with the careers and fortunes of the Royal Stewarts of the elder line. Their forefathers, of Breton origin, were about 200 years in Scotland before Robert the Steward in 1371 succeeded to the throne; the joint reigns of the Stewart sovereigns in Scotland, until the accession of James VI. to the English throne, comprised about 232 years; his reign as British sovereign, combined with that of Charles I., extended to about 46 years; there was about 11 years of a Cromwellian or Puritan interregnum; Charles II., not counting the short Scottish episode, reigned for nearly 25 years; within less than 4 years after his death, his successor, James II., fled the country; and the legitimate heirs of James II. remained in exile until the death of the last member of the dynasty, about 119 years after the flight from England.

The dynasty had relations with Scotland for a period about four times longer than that of its English rule. Almost inevitably, therefore, it left, directly or indirectly and for good or evil, deeper traces of its influence on Scottish than on English

annals; but yet the Stewart period in English history is, as regards its bearing on England's ecclesiastical and constitutional fortunes, hardly more than rivalled by the Tudor one, — intimately associated though the latter came to be with the unique era of the Reformation, — while the astounding character of several of its occurrences confer on it a certain pre-eminence of historical interest. Then, ineffective as were the efforts of the exiles to regain the throne of their ancestors, the romantic attachment of their followers to their cause created a series of stratagems and conspiracies which now and again gave birth to more or less critical and exciting situations.

In history proper, the lives even of sovereigns can be recorded only in a somewhat broken, interrupted, and fractional form. Even in their case, therefore, biography becomes a kind of necessary complement to history. While, however, the primary purpose of the present volume is biographical, an attempt has been made to trace the influence of the idiosyncrasies of the several sovereigns on contemporary and subsequent events. As the record of the fortunes of a royal house, the volume has also a unity of theme linking together its several parts, and the unity is accentuated by the striking unity of purpose which characterised the Stewarts. It was derived from a strong conviction of their sovereign rights; and since this conviction had to contend with very peculiar difficulties, the annals of few or no dynasties have been associated with such a singular succession of stirring incidents and tragic vicissitudes.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE	v
I. THE EARLIER STEWARTS	1
II. JAMES I. AND JAMES II.—THE ASSERTION OF SOVEREIGNTY	27
III. JAMES III. AND JAMES IV.—SAUCHIEBURN AND FLODDEN	54
IV. JAMES V., THE GUDEMAN OF BALLENGEICH	93
V. MARY—UNTIL THE MARRIAGE TO DARNLEY	112
VI. MARY — FROM THE DARNLEY MARRIAGE UNTIL HER EXECUTION	134
VII. JAMES VI. AND I.—AS SCOTTISH SOVEREIGN	159
VIII. JAMES VI. AND I.—AS BRITISH SOVEREIGN	181
IX. CHARLES I.—THE PREPARATION FOR THE TRAGEDY	222
X. CHARLES I.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRAGEDY	253
XI. CHARLES II.—UNTIL THE RESTORATION	296
XII. CHARLES II.—UNTIL THE FALL OF CLARENDON	329
XIII. CHARLES II.—THE CABAL, THE POPIISH TERROR, AND THE TRIUMPH OF THE KING	351
XIV. JAMES II. AND VII.—AS DUKE OF YORK	378
XV. JAMES II. AND VII.—“QUOS DEUS VULT PERDERE”	403
XVI. JAMES II. AND VII.—NEMESIS	434
XVII. JAMES FRANCIS EDWARD	461

XVIII. CHARLES EDWARD—BEFORE CULLODEN	489
XIX. CHARLES EDWARD—AFTER CULLODEN	521
XX. HENRY BENEDICT, CARDINAL YORK	535
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE	549
INDEX	565
PEDIGREE	<i>At end</i>

ILLUSTRATIONS.

JAMES FRANCIS EDWARD (JAMES III. AND VIII.)	. . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
<i>From the picture by H. RIGAUD. By permission of the EARL OF ROSEBURY, K.G.</i>		
SEAL, COINS, AND SKULL OF KING ROBERT BRUCE . . .		<i>Facing p. 6</i>
GREAT SEAL OF ROBERT II. COIN OF QUEEN MARY. COIN OF ROBERT III. COIN OF JAMES I. GREAT SEAL OF ROBERT III.		" 22
KING JAMES I.		" 28
<i>From the panel portrait in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery.</i>		
KING JAMES II.		" 48
<i>From the panel portrait in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery.</i>		
JAMES III. AND HIS SON, AFTERWARDS JAMES IV. . . .		" 56
<i>From the painting, probably by VAN DER GOES, in Holyrood Palace.</i>		
KING JAMES IV.		" 70
<i>From the panel portrait in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery.</i>		
JAMES V. AND MARY OF LORRAINE		" 100
<i>From the picture in the collection of the DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.</i>		
MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS, IN 1559-1560.		" 114
<i>From the contemporary panel in the Jones Collection, South Kensington.</i>		
ANNE OF DENMARK, QUEEN CONSORT OF JAMES VI. AND I. . . .		" 172
<i>From the painting by P. VAN SOMER in the National Portrait Gallery, London.</i>		
KING JAMES VI. AND I.		" 192
<i>From the painting by P. VAN SOMER in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court Palace.</i>		
HENRIETTA MARIA, QUEEN CONSORT OF CHARLES I.		" 226
<i>From the painting, after Sir A. VAN DYCK, in the National Portrait Gallery, London. Photo, Emery Walker Ltd.</i>		

KING CHARLES I. AS HE SAT IN HIS TRIAL AT WESTMINSTER	<i>Facing p.</i>	284
<i>From the painting by EDWARD BOWER. By permission of the Warden of All Souls' College, Oxford.</i>		
KING CHARLES II.	"	318
<i>From the painting by MRS MARY BEALE in the National Portrait Gallery, London. Photo, Emery Walker Ltd.</i>		
CATHARINE OF BRAGANZA, QUEEN CONSORT OF CHARLES II.	"	338
<i>From the painting by DIRK STOOP in the National Portrait Gallery, London. Photo, Emery Walker Ltd.</i>		
KING JAMES II. AND VII. AS DUKE OF YORK.	"	386
<i>From the portrait by SIR PETER LELY in St James's Palace, by permission of HIS MAJESTY THE KING. Photo, Emery Walker Ltd.</i>		
MARY OF MODENA, QUEEN CONSORT OF JAMES II.	"	396
<i>From the painting by W. WISSING in the National Portrait Gallery, London. Photo, Emery Walker Ltd.</i>		
JAMES FRANCIS EDWARD (JAMES III. AND VIII.) AS A BOY	"	462
<i>Miniature in possession of A. G. MAXTONE GRAHAM, Esq. of Cultoquhey.</i>		
CHARLES EDWARD (CHARLES III.)	"	490
<i>From the painting, studio of NATTIER, in the National Portrait Gallery, London. Photo, Emery Walker Ltd.</i>		
CHARLES EDWARD (CHARLES III.)	"	506
<i>From the portrait by B. GANNARI. By permission of Sir JAMES HAMLYN WILLIAMS-DRUMMOND, Bart.</i>		
HENRY BENEDICT, CARDINAL YORK (HENRY IX.)	"	536
<i>From the painting, possibly by NATTIER, in the National Portrait Gallery, London. Photo, Emery Walker Ltd.</i>		
HENRY BENEDICT, CARDINAL YORK (HENRY IX.)	"	548
<i>From the portrait in crayons by ROSALBA CARRIERA in the National Portrait Gallery, London. Photo, Emery Walker Ltd.</i>		

THE ROYAL STEWARTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLIER STEWARTS.

INQUIRY as to the ancestral origin of the Stewarts has been not a little darkened by the speculative predilections of romantic Scottish patriots. In the case of the female line, the darkening began before the Stewart genealogy was a matter of national interest—by zeal on behalf of the older line of Scottish sovereigns. Could it be made out that the dynasty was the oldest in Britain, the English claims to overlordship would be overthrown. Hence the amazing tale of the learned Baldred Bisset—when, on behalf of Scottish independence, he appeared in 1301 before Pope Boniface VIII.—as recorded in his *Progressus contra figmenta regis Angliæ*; that the founder of the Dalriadic dynasty and the progenitress of the Scoto-Pictish kings was no other than Pharaoh's daughter Scota, who brought with her to Scotland the coronation stone of Scone!

Equally mythical if not essentially incredible, is the story that the earliest of the Scottish sovereigns was the Dalriadic Fergus, son of Ferquhard, who, according

to the erudite Buchanan, "began to reign in the year of the world 3641, before the coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ 330 years, in the first of the 112th Olympiad, and in the 421st of the building of Rome; about the beginning of the third monarchy of the Grecians, when Alexander the Great overthrew Darius Codomanus, the last monarch of Persia." As matter of fact, the founder of the Dalriadic dynasty was Fergus Mor Mac Earca, who, migrating from Ireland, died as late as 502 A.D.; though, by marriage, the later Dalriadic sovereigns had a blood relationship, not merely with the sovereigns of the older Brythonic and Goidelic races, but, it may be, with those of an aboriginal royal line as old as that of the Pharaohs, if quite unrelated to it.

With the tradition of the remote antiquity of the Scottish dynasty was interwoven that of the mysterious Stone of Destiny on which the Scottish sovereigns were throned at Scone. It was even supposed that the stone which Scota brought with her to Scotland was that which Jacob used as a pillow at Bethel. A similar mystic virtue to that of the Bethel stone was attached to it: it was credited with guaranteeing dominion to the Scots. So greatly was also Edward I. of England impressed by its mystic repute that he carried it to Westminster, and, setting aside the old Saxon stone, made it the coronation chair of future English kings. Neither to himself nor his dynasty did it bring what he fondly hoped—dominion over Scotland; but, as if under the spell of its mysterious attraction, the Scottish dynasty, in the end, followed it to Westminster, and became monarchs of England as well as Scotland. Though, also, to the Scottish kings of the elder Stewart line it failed, unhappily, to guarantee a successful and permanent sovereignty over Britain, it is still the coronation chair of a

dynasty whose title is partly their Dalriadic descent, and which now wields the sceptre of the most wondrous empire the world has seen.

So much for the ancestors of the royal Stewarts in the female line. The dynasty originated less than six hundred years ago, through the accession, in 1371, of Robert, son of the great Steward of Scotland by Marjory, daughter of Robert the Bruce. Probability now also points to a non-Scottish origin for the male Stewart line, as for that of the preceding short Bruce dynasty, although an original Scottish descent has long been claimed for it. An ancient tradition, similar to that which traces the female line to the mythical Fergus, connects the male line with the great Kenneth M'Alpine—who in the ninth century became by conquest joint sovereign of the Picts and Scots—through a supposed descendant Banquo, Thane of Lochaber, to whom the witches, on the blasted heath, foretold a better destiny than that which was to be Macbeth's. To quote the Shakesperean version of the weird words, founded on the Boece-Holinshed story, Banquo was declared to be lesser than Macbeth, yet greater, not so happy, yet much happier. He was "to get kings" though he was to be "none himself," whereas, though Macbeth was himself to become a king, his end was to be inglorious, and he was to have no issue to succeed him.

Yet, if we accept the same tradition, Banquo's own fate was hardly happier than that of Macbeth. He did not enjoy even a short lease of royal power, and he died a sudden and violent death. Macbeth erroneously supposed that since Banquo was to "get kings," the likelihood was that he or his son Fleance was to be the instrument of effecting his "inglorious end." Resolved, therefore, that neither father nor son should oust him from his throne, he determined to

murder him as he had already murdered Duncan. But the precautions he took were as needless as they were futile. While the father, innocent of the smallest evil intention against Macbeth, was slain, the son, who was equally innocent of any design on Macbeth's throne, made—so tradition had it—his escape to Wales, where, following the example of other heroes of romance, he married the Princess of the country, Nesta, daughter of Griffith Ap Llewellyn. Like his father, he was, in the end, slain, but he left a son who escaped the knife of the assassin. This young man, by name Walter, is stated to have taken temporary refuge in the court of Edward the Confessor, but to have afterwards withdrawn to that of Alan Earl of Brittany.

With this Walter the tradition touched in a manner on reality; but Mr J. H. Round, in his *Peerage and Family History* (1901), has shown that the traditional story of his descent is a mere myth: that Banquo can hardly be reckoned more than a mythological ghost,—a much more “unreal mockery” than that which haunted King Macbeth. While Chalmers, in his *Caledonia* (1807), established that Walter was not the son of Fleance, son of Banquo, but the son of Alan, the son of Flaald, a knight of Brittany, who acquired the manor of Oswestrie from Henry I. of England, Mr Round has proved the father of Flaald to have been Alan, dapifer of Dol. But this Alan is a mere name. That he existed is known only from the fact that Flaald is mentioned as brother and son of Alan, dapifer. Besides giving us the paternity of Flaald, this fact enables us to distinguish Alan his father from Alan Fitzalan, who was a leader of the first Crusade of 1097. Of Flaald himself the only verified fact is that discovered by Mr Round—that he was present at the dedication of Monmouth Priory in

1101 or 1102, as a baron of the Lord of Monmouth, William son of Baderon, a son of Rhiwallon, lord of Dol. What connection Alan retained with Brittany is unknown, but his eldest son Jordan — whether immediately from his grand-uncle or his father — succeeded to the Breton possessions and to the office of dapifer of Dol. Alan Fitz Flaald had two other sons — William, ancestor of the Fitzalans, Earls of Arundel; and Walter, the progenitor of the Stewart kings.

The grandfather of Walter Fitzalan was thus not a thane of Lochaber; nor was his arrival in Scotland that of a wanderer to the land of his forefathers. It is sufficiently explained by the early residence of the Scottish David I. at the court of Henry I. Having thus made the acquaintance of David I., Fitzalan probably accompanied him to Scotland; and he became dapifer to him while he was still Prince of Cambria. From him he received a large tract of land corresponding to what is now Renfrewshire, with a portion of Kyle in Ayrshire. The principal residence of the family was at Renfrew, which, in a charter granted to it by Walter in 1160, is styled “our town of Renfrew.” Walter, who died in 1177, also founded in 1160, near the small and then beautiful river Cart, the Abbey of Paisley, which, amidst pleasant rural surroundings, became the burial-place of the family, but whose precincts are now infringed on by the drab streets of a busy town, famed in modern times partly for poetry, but mainly for thread, starch, and corn-flour.

The rise in Scotland of the younger branch of the Breton family of Dol, until they ascended the Scottish and then the British throne, forms as wonderful a tale of good fortune as is to be found in any country’s annals. Of Walter’s son and successor in the stewardship, Alan, who died in 1204, nothing of importance

is recorded ; but the increasing influence of the family is shown in the appointment of his son, Walter the High Steward, to the office of Justiciary of Scotland. Dying in 1246, he was succeeded by his son Alexander, who immensely increased the prestige and power of the family by his marriage to the daughter of Angus, second son of Somerled, Lord of the Isles, which gave him a claim to the possession of Bute and Arran. His preponderating influence in the western regions caused him, also, to be chosen commander to resist the expedition of Haco of Norway for the succour of the Norse settlers ; and his triumph over Haco — which led to the cession of Man and the Western Isles to the Scottish Crown — is entitled to be ranked as one of the outstanding events in Scottish history.

During the troubled years that followed the death of King Alexander in 1286, James, who succeeded his father in 1283, felicitously chose “the better part,” — the better part under very peculiar circumstances. The sudden rise of Sir William Wallace to the military leadership of the Scots against England is hardly less astonishing than the career of Joanne of Arc ; and one sufficient evidence of the unique character of his personality is the fact that both the Steward and his brother Sir John condescended to fight under his banner, though he was merely a feudal dependent of theirs. Sir John was killed in 1298 at the battle of Falkirk, where he commanded the men of Bute. The elder brother, who died in 1309, lived to be an ardent supporter of the cause of Robert the Bruce.

Walter, the High Steward, son of James, while but in his twenty-first year — or, as Barbour puts it, only “a beardless lunc,” — arrived at the head of the men of Renfrew and Bute to the assistance of Bruce at



SEAL, COINS, AND SKULL OF KING ROBERT BRUCE.

Torwood, just before the battle of Bannockburn in June 1314. Owing to his youth, his division was joined with that of the good Sir James Douglas, his "cousin in high degree," in order that he might benefit by the counsel of that famed and experienced Nestor. Both the stripling and the veteran were knighted by Bruce immediately before the memorable battle. The men under Douglas and the Steward, forming the left division of the Scottish army, were soon in the thick of the *mêlée*. It was a day rich in all kinds of martial lessons; and, according to Barbour, the Steward stood, henceforth, in no need of military supervision.

Towards the close of the year the young Steward was sent by the king to receive on the Borders certain Scottish prisoners of distinction liberated from captivity in England—more particularly Elizabeth, the king's second wife, and his daughter Marjory by his first wife. In the following year he obtained the hand of Marjory—a significant sign of how high he stood in the esteem of the Bruce. She was then very near prospective heir to the crown; for the son, who became David II., was yet unborn, and the king's brother, Edward Bruce, was childless. The heirship of the daughter was also formally recognised. Some time previous to the marriage the succession to the crown was settled, in the case of the death of King Robert without heirs-male of his body, on his brother Edward Bruce and his heirs-male, and, failing him, on King Robert's daughter Marjory. The Steward lost his wife in 1316, but she left a son, Robert, born 22nd March of the same year; and on the death of Edward Bruce without heirs-male, a Parliament held at Scone, 3rd December 1318, enacted that in the case of the death of King Robert without lawful heirs-male descended of his body, Robert, the

son of Marjory and the Steward, should succeed as king. For over six years thereafter—until the birth to Robert the Bruce of a son David, afterwards David II.—the Steward's son was prospective heir to the crown, and in station and influence the Steward thus occupied a position second only to that of the king. He died at the early age of thirty-three, at his castle of Bathgate, 9th April 1326: a great and heroic warrior, who in his short life had, by special feats of arms, won renown hardly inferior to that of the immortal companions of the Bruce—Randolph and Douglas.

When Walter the Steward died his son was but ten years old, and was no longer heir to the crown, for a son, David, had been born to the Bruce on 5th March 1324. A second son did not, however, long survive, and on the death of Bruce, 7th June 1329, only one life remained between the throne and the young Steward, and it was that of a mere infant. But it soon became doubtful whether any descendant of Bruce would retain the sovereignty of Scotland. The regent, Donald Earl of Mar, was defeated and slain at Dupplin Moor by Edward, son of John Baliol, the old opponent of the Bruce, after which Baliol, on 24th September 1332, was crowned at Scone, the crown being put on his head by the captive Earl of Fife.

During the distressful years succeeding Baliol's coronation, the youthful Steward played an important part in resisting the designs of Edward III. to utilise Baliol as his puppet in the annihilation of Scottish independence. He is described by Fordoun at this time as "a comely youth, tall and robust, modest, liberal, gay and courteous, and for the innate sweetness of his disposition generally beloved by all true-hearted Scotsmen." In his youthful years he showed a physical daring and resolution worthy of his heroic ancestry.

But the earlier efforts of the patriotic party were of very little avail. By the defeat at Halidon Hill, 19th July 1333, it seemed, for a time, as if Bannockburn was more than avenged. "It was the general voice," wrote an English annalist, "that the Scottish wars were ended, for that no man remained of that nation who had influence to assemble or skill to lead an army." "The whole of Scotland," writes the contemporary, Sir Thomas Gray, in his *Scalachronica*, "was in subjection to the King of England and to him [Baliol], except the castle of Dumbarton, whence King David de Brus, who was still a youth, was removed to Chateau Galliard in France, where he and his wife, the king's [Edward's] sister, remained a long time, until he was of such age that he might return." Scotland's plight now seemed so desperate that had the English king been content with a kind of fealty from Baliol, he might have succeeded in establishing his substantial overlordship; but instead of seeking to reconcile Scotland to Baliol's rule, he determined to paralyse future resistance to his pretensions by snatching from the Scottish Crown the whole of the district between the Forth and the Tweed, which, anciently, formed the district of Bernicia. Over this region his henchman Baliol was not even to be sub-king. But though base enough to consent to such a compact, Baliol was powerless to execute it. No such recreant king could secure the loyalty of the Scottish people; and dissensions also began to occur among his own followers. The patriotic party resolved, therefore, to bestir themselves against him. The young Steward, who had retired to the inaccessible Bute, crossed the Firth of Clyde to Dumbarton, and obtaining the aid of Donald Campbell of Lochawe, recovered his castle of Dunoon, and then won back his territory in Renfrew for the support of his own cause and that of David II. Thereafter he and John,

Earl of Moray, were recognised by the Scots as joint regents of the kingdom; but the extremity of Baliol caused Edward to make a special effort on his behalf; and while Edward overran that portion of Scotland which he formally claimed as his own, Baliol, after devastating Evandale and south-western Scotland, celebrated his Christmas at the Steward's castle of Renfrew.

In 1335 the two regents held a parliament at Dairsie, near Cupar-Fife; but owing to dissensions, it broke up without any plan of defence being concerted; and after the capture, in August, of the Earl of Moray near the Borders, the Steward, along with Atholl, is stated to have assented to a treaty with Edward. Of Atholl's assent there is no doubt, but we have no definite information of the Steward's relations with Edward, nor have we any record of his doings until his election as regent on the death, in 1338, of Sir Andrew Moray. If he had shown any recreancy to the patriotic cause, it now disappeared. In the beginning of 1339 he laid siege to Perth, then the headquarters of the English party. It surrendered on 17th August. Shortly afterwards the fortress of Stirling was taken; and after the enemy had been driven from every position of strength north of the Forth, Edinburgh was gained by stratagem, so that when David, a few weeks afterwards, landed with his consort Joanna in Kincardineshire, the Steward was able to hand over to him a re-liberated Scotland.

But, for Scotland, it had been better had David remained in exile. He lacked the strenuous audacity needed for the great vocation to which he had fallen heir; and the main mitigation of the disaster of Neville's Cross, 17th October 1346, was that David himself was taken prisoner. For fourteen years he remained a captive in England, and the Steward as

regent continued to reign in his stead. By detaining him Edward was more a loser than a gainer, for the Steward was the more capable and trustworthy ruler. After the arrangement of a truce between England and France in 1354, in which Scotland was included, a treaty was concluded for David's ransom by the payment of 90,000 merks in ten yearly instalments; but on the receipt of help in men and money from France, the Scots immediately became indifferent to their king's fate and proceeded to harass the English by attacks on the Borders. Thereupon Edward, in the following year, prevailed on Baliol to deliver up to him the Scottish crown and formally annexed Scotland to England. Notwithstanding this, the Scots, by payment of a heavy ransom, concluded, on 3rd October 1357, an agreement for the possession of their king; but it proved a very bad bargain, for he was almost as ready as Baliol had been to betray the country to Edward. The taxation necessary for his ransom formed also in itself an almost intolerable burden, which was further increased by his reckless extravagance.

It was thus small wonder that in 1363 the general discontent found expression in an armed remonstrance, headed by the Earl of Douglas with the countenance of the Steward and the Earl of March; but Douglas was surprised at Lanark and the Steward was compelled to take an oath of fealty and renounce his band with Douglas, March, and his own sons. If the Steward's conduct partly explains, it hardly excuses the subsequent negotiations of David with Edward III. In October 1363 he went to England, and on condition that the payment of his ransom was remitted, actually agreed to acknowledge Edward as his successor should he have no male-heir. Having in the spring of this year married as his second wife Margaret Logie, he, doubtless, fondly hoped that a male-heir would bless

the marriage ; but, even so, his attitude towards his kingdom was cynically selfish. A modified form of this agreement was proposed by him to the Scottish Parliament at Scone in March 1364. Not Edward nor the Prince of Wales, but another son of Edward was to be recognised as heir ; and there were conditions which ostensibly guaranteed the country's independence. But the Scots were evidently not disposed to insult so good and great a patriot as the Steward to gratify so worthless a king ; and as they could put no faith in any arrangement that gave the English dynasty a hold on their country, the proposal was indignantly rejected.

From the perils with which she was threatened by the follies of a weak and unpatriotic king, Scotland obtained temporary deliverance by the outbreak, in 1369, of a war between England and France, but the death of David, 22nd February 1370-1, can hardly be deemed other than a most happy deliverance for her. Happening when it did, it was a special stroke of good fortune ; for England was not then in a position to interfere with the succession, while every additional year of David's sovereignty was fraught with more and more danger to the nation's liberty.

The accession of Robert the Steward was at first demurred to by the Earl of Douglas. The Steward's withdrawal from the band of David II. may have caused an alienation between them ; and Douglas may also have been jealous of the royal claims of a family not more powerful and renowned than his. Bower also affirms that the pretext of the claim was asserted heirship to the Comyns and the Baliols ; but there is no extant genealogical evidence of this ; and even had there been, such claims were not of a kind to win the assent of the nobles and the nation. On his own merits and those of his illustrious ancestors, Douglas, in lack of heirs to the Bruce, might well, with universal

acclamation, have been elevated to the sovereignty of Scotland. But it was impossible to overlook the legitimate heir to the Bruce, whose forefathers had also almost as great a record as the Douglasses, and who, himself, had rendered signal service to his country. Finding that his pretensions were not likely to receive much support, Douglas therefore did not persist in them. With other nobles and barons he attended the coronation of the Steward at Scone, 26th March 1371, and swore fealty to him; and the breach between them was healed by the marriage of the king's daughter Isabel to Douglas's eldest son James, the subsequent hero of Otterburn.

Though the Steward was heir of the Bruces, his coronation was the elevation of a new family to the sovereignty; but it was not this alone that aroused the special interest of the nobles and the nation: it was the new and solemn pledge thus given of the nation's determination to retain its independence. Every effort was therefore made to give special *éclat* to the proceedings; and immediately after the assembled nobles and prelates had taken their oath to him, the newly-crowned monarch, now solemnly included in the illustrious succession of the long line of Scottish kings, stood up, and addressing the robed prelates and nobles of the nation, affirmed that following the example of his august grandfather, Robert the Bruce, he nominated his son, the Earl of Carrick and Steward of Scotland, heir to the crown in the event of his death. The nomination was at once ratified by the whole assemblage, and on the proclamation of the Earl of Carrick's heirship, the people showed their approval by loud acclamations.

But notwithstanding an inauguration so splendid and auspicious, the reign of Robert II. was necessarily difficult and precarious. Unlike Bruce, he had not

conquered a kingdom for himself and his children: he was not a peerless hero; others amongst the nobles had a patriotic renown as great as his. If the halo of the ancient Scoto-Pictish dynasty lingered faintly round the recreant David II., it was mainly because of his illustrious father; and the Stewart took rank rather from his own house than that of the Bruce. The accession of the new dynasty thus tended to develop the independent action of the nobles who, during the reign of Robert II., took the question of peace and war very much into their own hands. It is rather difficult to determine how far, in this respect, Robert II. was weak or merely prudent; but, at this juncture, Scotland might not have been so well served by a more strenuous ruler. There was now a lull in England's efforts against her. By the ignominious collapse of the cause of Edward Baliol—who died childless in 1367—they had received a severe check. Edward III. had now no special help from within the kingdom of Scotland; and though he nominally quashed the subordinate sovereignty, and, without any kind of subterfuge, annexed Scotland to the English crown, his French entanglements debarred him, meanwhile, from engaging in any prolonged contest to make good his claims. A fourteen years' truce had therefore, in 1369, been concluded between the two countries; and in 1372 Scotland still further safeguarded herself against English aggression through a treaty with France for common action against England, should circumstances seem to demand this.

Meanwhile, Robert II. was inclined to let sleeping dogs lie, though they were lying partly on Scottish territory; but he did not decidedly interfere with the bolder policy of the Border nobles whose territory was more particularly encroached on; and in the irre-

sponsible warfare they carried on they had the better fortune, and gradually caused the English to relax their grasp of a portion of Southern Scotland. Froissart ascribes the king's lack of interest in their feats to the fact that "he was no valiant man, but one who would rather remain at home than march to the field." But allowance must be made for the desire of Froissart, as a Frenchman, to keep the enmity between the English and Scots in glowing activity. In his earlier years the Steward had been valiant enough; but if time and again he had been thrilled with the excitement and intoxication of battle, he had also had a varied experience of the horrors and uncertainties of war, and of the inconveniences of English retaliation.

Since they lacked the direct countenance of the Scottish king, England was less disposed to take seriously the Border raids which he made only a partial effort to prevent. They thus became rather an exciting pastime than a serious struggle. Even the famous fight at Otterburn in 1388—the theme of several soul-stirring ballads—was, so far as any great national issues were concerned, a kind of mimic contest. Froissart glowingly describes it as one of the bravest, the best contested, and the most chivalrous battle ever fought; and it was peculiarly memorable on account of the heroic death of Douglas, whose dying directions assured the Scots the victory. But their triumph won for the Scots merely barren glory; and the expedition which ended in it was dictated rather by vainglorious folly than either practical or military wisdom. Happily it did not arouse any national outbreak of hostilities on the part of England. The Earl Marshal, to whom the custody of the English Marches was now committed, contented himself with keeping a careful watch against

Scottish attacks, and declined the offer of the Scots to arrange an opportunity for the northern earls to have their revenge.

This period of Scottish history is both a sad and a petty one. No imperative necessity, no high patriotic purpose inspired these later devastating enterprises with their attendant slaughters and miseries. While the actual conflicts were redeemed by a certain chivalry in the rival combatants, this was not extended to the helpless dwellers, through whose villages and farms swept the plundering hordes. Both agriculture and the social progress of the nation suffered severely from the general unsettlement caused by military movements and engrossment in military adventures. In the northern regions, also, a chronic anarchy prevailed, largely aggravated by the outrageous proceedings of the king's son, Alexander, "the Wolf of Badenoch." These disorders were not neglected by the king; but, owing to the southern embarrassment, they could not be dealt with in a manner sufficiently drastic. Thus the whole reign of Robert II.—though it cannot be strictly termed a failure—is distinguished by a peculiar ineffectiveness which, if partly the creation of special circumstances, yet stamps his character and aims as, at the best, mediocre. His intentions were good; he made no great blunder; a stronger man than he might, in the peculiar circumstances, have done worse; but his virtues were more negative than positive. As early as 1384, the king's eldest son, the Earl of Carrick, was, owing to the increasing infirmities of the father, appointed to superintend the enforcement of the law; and four years later, the second son, the Earl of Fife, was, owing to a severe bodily injury that had befallen his elder brother, made guardian of the kingdom with the full responsibility of government. For some years the aged king had

preferred to pass much of his time in his more remote castles, more particularly Rothesay, which, for many generations, had been the fortified home of his ancestors. The castle is now merely a picturesque ruin, neighboured by the streets of a fashionable watering-place. Even in winter Rothesay is now rather a stirring place; and in summer gay and motley crowds throng its promenades, while its hill-girdled bay is alive with boats, yachts, and crowded pleasure steamers. But in the time of Robert II. the dominating feature of the scene was not the County Buildings, nor the Aquarium, nor the public halls, nor the steepled kirks, nor the conventional sandstone villas; but the baronial castle, under whose shadow and protection nestled only a small cluster of huts. Behind it lay hills of heath and forest, probably almost untenanted except by birds and the beasts of the chase. Far or near, on the surrounding shores, the smoke of but few human dwellings would rise upwards towards the hills; a few fishing skiffs, a castle boat, a small provision vessel might occasionally be seen on the waters; but these slight indications of human activity would merely emphasise the depth of the quietude and peace which then girdled the beautiful bay. No more congenial retreat could have been found for one who wished to live remote from the cares of State and to pass his last days undisturbed by the fret of the outside world.

Another remote castle, that of Dundonald, in Kyle Stewart, Ayrshire, shared with Rothesay the king's periods of leisure. The roofless square keep of this castle still crowns a finely-rounded eminence behind the still rather antique-looking village of Dundonald. Rising abruptly from a wide plain, skirting at some distance the sea-shore, with the peaked Arran mountains to the west, the eminence commands an extensive and variegated prospect, and crowned by its ancient keep

it is itself a prominent feature in the Kyle Stewart landscape. But the castle is rather a picturesque than imposing ruin. "Though of considerable size," says Boswell, who visited it with Dr Johnson, "we could not by any power of imagination figure it as having been a suitable habitation for majesty. Dr Johnson, to irritate my old Scottish enthusiasm, was very jocular on the homely accommodation of 'King Bob,' and roared and laughed till the ruins echoed." The Stewards were, however, as comfortably accommodated in Dundonald as were other of the Norman barons, either in Scotland or England, in their less important keeps; and Dundonald was endeared to Robert II. by very special associations. It was a very early, it may be the first, Scottish home of the Fitzalans; and to it, in his early manhood, he had brought Elizabeth Muir when she eloped with him from Rowallan: here they spent their honeymoon and a large portion of many happy years. We may well, therefore, believe that memories of the past induced him to choose it as the most fitting place in which to pass his last hours; and it was here that he died, 13th May 1390.

With every royal honour, and much costly pomp, he was buried in the ancient royal abbey at Scone, an elaborate monumental tomb—sculptured, at his instance, in his lifetime by Nicholas Haen, the king's mason, and decorated by Andrew the painter,—being brought for his interment from the Church of St John, Perth, where it had been deposited.

During a lull in the strife against England, the young Steward had found opportunity to win the heart of Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Adam Muir of Rowallan. Rowallan and Dundonald keeps were but six miles apart, and he succeeded in persuading her to elope with him to Dundonald. But why did he carry

her off, and how was it supposed that they lived together for many years in mere concubinage? Did he make application for her hand, or if he did, why was the suit refused,—refused to one who could claim to be the grandson of Robert the Bruce, and whose heirs might yet sit on the Scottish throne? Until recently the only available explanation was that, while deeply in love with the lady, he was not disposed to make her his wife. But the publication in 1864 by Theiner (*Vetera Monumenta*, p. 214) of a Papal document of 1344, reveals that, while but a child of eleven years, she had been contracted in marriage to Hugh de Giffard, the nine-year-old son of Sir John de Giffard of Yester, Mid-Lothian. In addition to the barrier of contract, there was a barrier—of which they may be supposed to have been ignorant,—a double barrier of consanguinity, the Steward being related to Elizabeth Muir in the fourth degree, and having had illicit intercourse with Isabel Boutellier, a lady related to her in the third and fourth degrees. For the barrier of consanguinity a dispensation might have been obtained. The barrier of the adverse contract was a different matter; it needed removal not merely ecclesiastically, but by the consent of both contracting parties or their parents; and being unable to untie this knot, the Steward—with the rash boldness of youth and love—resolved to cut it by eloping with the lady.

In 1347 a Papal dispensation was obtained removing the barrier of consanguinity; but in this dispensation there is no reference to any previous marriage *de facto*; and it has been assumed that up till then the Steward and Elizabeth Muir had been living together in avowed concubinage. No other inference could, in ordinary circumstances, have been drawn from the terms of the dispensation; but if the parties, notwithstanding the adverse contract, had

gone through a form of marriage, they could hardly state this in their petition; and the terms of the dispensation were necessarily made to correspond with the petition's terms. In the document of 1344 no reference is made to the Steward; the annulment was granted on the joint petition of Hugh Giffard and Elizabeth Muir, and on the ground that the proposed marriage had not been consummated.

The long continuance of the connection is almost proof positive of some kind of bond between the parties; and that the Steward induced a priest to perform the marriage ceremony seems to receive a certain support from a statement in Sir William Mure's *Historie and Descent of the Family of Rowallane*: "Mr John Learmonth, chaplain to Alex., Archbishop of St Andrews, hath left on record, in a deduction of the descent of the House of Rowallan, collected by him at command of the said Archbishop, that Robert, Great Steward of Scotland, having taken away the said Elizabeth, drew to Sir Adam her father ane instrument that he should take her to be his lawful wife, which myself have seen, saith the collector, as also ane instrument in Latin by Roger M'Adam, priest of our Lady Marie's Chapel, that the said Roger married Robert and Elizabeth foresaids." The instrument seems to have been given by the Steward to the lady's father to reconcile him to the elopement, and the marriage ceremony would be the natural consequence and fulfilment of the promise in the instrument. When, in 1347, the Steward made application for a Papal dispensation, he made it not to satisfy his father-in-law, but in order to make sure of his children's succession to the throne should David II. die childless.

In Burnet's preface to vol. ii. of *The Exchequer Rolls*, it is affirmed that "it remained a point admit-

ting of doubt among canonists, whether such a provision, in the absence of any assertion either of a previous marriage, or of ignorance of the impediment, conferred the full status of legitimacy on the offspring." But this is not so. The dispensation affirms that they were ignorant of the impediment, though, as already stated, there was no question of a previous marriage. Riddell (*Legal Tracts*, 1835) to whom Burnet refers for a full discussion of the subject, merely expresses his doubts as to the general value of assertions of ignorance of affinity in cases of concubinage, and more particularly in this case; but he was ignorant of the later revealed facts.

After the death of Elizabeth Muir, the Steward received, in 1355, a dispensation for his marriage with Euphemia, daughter of Hugh, Earl of Ross, and widow of John Randolph, Earl of Moray, the parties being related in the fourth degree of consanguinity. She died in 1387. Before her death an Act of Parliament was passed, in 1373, settling the succession of the crown on the sons of Robert II. by his "wife Elizabeth Muir," and their issue male in order, failing them on his sons by his second wife, Euphemia Ross, and their issue male; and, in default of both, the heirs whatsoever of the last heir-male. On account of this Act, it has been affirmed that the title of the Stewarts did not depend on their legitimacy, that it was purely parliamentary; but the Act implies the very opposite of this. The Stewarts succeeded to the throne as the legitimate descendants of Robert the Bruce; and the Act of 1373 did nothing more than confirm the original settlement made at the instance of the Bruce.

By his first wife Robert II. had four sons and four daughters. The sons were John, who ascended the throne as Robert III.; Walter, who married Isabel, Countess of Fife, but died soon afterwards without

issue; Robert, who became Earl of Fife, as heir of the Countess Isabel, widow of his brother Walter, and who, on 28th April 1398, was created Duke of Albany; and Alexander, known as the "Wolf of Badenoch," who left no legitimate children. The daughters were Margaret, married to John, Lord of the Isles; Mary, married to John, brother of John, Earl of Dunbar, and created Earl of Moray; Elizabeth, married to Thomas of Hay, Constable of Scotland; Isabel, married first to James, Earl of Douglas, and second to Sir John Edmonstone, ancestor of the family of Duntreath; and Jean, married first to Sir John Keith, eldest son of William, Earl Marischal; second to Sir John Lyon, ancestor of the Earls of Strathmore; and third to Sir John Sandilands, ancestor of the Lords of Torphichen.

By his second wife Euphemia, daughter of Hugh, Earl of Ross, whom he married about 1355, he had two sons: David, Earl of Strathearn, who left no male issue; and Walter, Lord of Brechin, and afterwards Earl of Atholl. The daughters were Egedia, married to the famous knight Sir William Douglas of Nithsdale; and Jean, Elizabeth, or Catherine, married to the still more famous knight, Sir David Lindsay—created Earl of Crawford—the victor of the famous tournament fight with Lord Wells on London Bridge.

By different mistresses he had a number of illegitimate children. In accordance with a common custom, several of the sons were provided for by presentation to offices in the Church. Another, Sir John Stewart, became Sheriff of Bute, and was ancestor of the Marquises of that name.

It was probably because the name John was associated with the hated memories of Baliol that John, the eldest son of Robert II., was crowned king as Robert III. As before, the duties of guardian of



1. GREAT SEAL OF ROBERT II.

2. COIN OF QUEEN MARY.

3. COIN OF ROBERT III.

4. COIN OF JAMES I.

5. GREAT SEAL OF ROBERT III.

the kingdom were undertaken by the Earl of Fife, Robert III. being little more than titular sovereign. The concurrent existence of what was practically a regency along with a sovereignty, tended to increase the independent power of the nobles, a significant sign of which was the annuity granted to many of them for "retinue and service," retinue and service which were part of their lawful obligations as nobles. The earlier years of the reign—which were marked by unbroken peace with England, the truce being prolonged until 1399—were notable mainly for the lawless feats of the king's brother, Alexander, whose ruthless savagery in the northern regions earned for him the title of "the Wolf of Badenoch," and whose misdoings reached a climax when, having been excommunicated by the Bishop of Moray for seizing some of his lands, he retaliated by sacrilegiously setting fire in 1392 to the town and magnificent cathedral of Elgin. For this crowning act of lawlessness, he was both required to make reparation and to do penance in front of the high altar of the Dominican church of Perth. He died not long afterwards; but his savage characteristics were transmitted to his sons, all of them illegitimate; but neither their wild outrages, nor the brutal conflict in 1396, without quarter, of picked men of rival clans on the North Inch of Perth, need here be further alluded to, than as illustrations of the primitive savagery prevailing in the northern regions.

The special domestic interest of the reign begins with the superseding in January 1398-9 of the Earl of Fife in the guardianship of the kingdom by the king's eldest son David. Shortly before this the Earl of Fife had been created Duke of Albany and Prince David Duke of Rothesay: the earliest instance of the title "Duke" in Scotland. Frank and pleasant in

manner and, according to Winton, possessed of some literary accomplishment, young Rothesay, if by no means so sinisterly savage as his uncle "the Wolf," was quite as headstrong. He began his irresponsible career by giving mortal offence to the powerful Earl of March, whose daughter he unscrupulously jilted for the sake of the larger dowry obtainable by marrying a daughter of the Earl of Douglas. In revenge March transferred his homage to Henry IV., who had just superseded Richard II. on the English throne. Encouraged by the secession of March, and irritated by the renewal of hostilities on the Borders, Henry, on 6th August 1400, summoned the Scottish king and peers to perform the homage "due ever since the days of Locrine, son of Brut." To this the hare-brained Rothesay replied by a quixotic proposal to decide the quarrel by a tournament fight between eleven nobles of both countries; but it met with a scornful reply from Henry IV., who laid siege to Edinburgh Castle, which Rothesay successfully maintained against him, until the rebellion of Owen Glendower caused his return to England.

While possessing the confident and dashing qualities which captivate the multitude, Rothesay, by the character of his dissoluteness, created for himself several bitter enemies, including, it would seem, his father-in-law, the Earl of Douglas; and his illegal extortions of money were so inordinate as to make the government of the kingdom a byword and a scandal. For the non-renewal of his office at the expiry of his three years' term there were thus abundant reasons; and his arrest and imprisonment in Falkland were almost the inevitable consequences of his own folly. Not long after his imprisonment he died, 27th March 1402, according to the general belief, of starvation or slow poison; according to the version of those who had him

in charge, of dysentery. Almost inevitably the circumstances of his death suggested foul play, and that by Albany, who had everything to gain by his death, and could not but dread the possibility of his succession to the throne. The declaration of the Estates that he had died by the visitation of Providence may be termed almost an open verdict. The close and unhealthy confinement may have caused a fatal dysentery, but the real circumstances of his death were known only to those at the beck of Albany; and it is significant that John Wright, one of the persons to whose care Rothesay was committed, appears in the Exchequer Rolls in 1412 as in receipt of £108 from the customs of Albany, at that time regent. Besides, once Albany had imprisoned him, he could not afford that he should ever again obtain his liberty. Other events, external rather than domestic, such as the disaster of Nesbit Moor and the still greater one of Homildon, hardly come within the scope of our present consideration, for Robert III. had but an indirect connection with them. The imprisonment and death of Rothesay filled his later years with grief; and the capture, in March 1406, of his only surviving son, as he was being sent for greater safety to France, completely broke his heart. He died 4th April, most probably, like his father, at Dundonald, not Rothesay, as is sometimes stated.

Unlike his father, he was, probably by his own request, buried not at Scone, but with his uncrowned ancestors before the high altar of the Abbey Church of Paisley. In accordance with his deprecatory wishes, there was no pompous display at his funeral. Conscious of his hopeless inferiority in ability and strength of will to his brother Albany, convinced also, most likely, that his calamities were due, in one way or another, to his own lack of spirit and resolution, he died in the sad persuasion that his reign had been a grievous failure,

and he desired to have his own unhappy opinion of himself engraven on his tomb: "Here lies the worst of kings and the most miserable of men."

By Annabella, daughter of Sir John Drummond of Stobhall—whom he married about 1367, and who died in 1401, before the double calamity that saddened the last years of her husband—Robert III. had, besides David, Duke of Rothesay, and James who succeeded him as James I., a son David who died young. The daughters were Marjory (or Egidia), married to Archibald, fourth Earl of Douglas and Duke of Tourraine; Mary, married first to George Douglas, Earl of Angus—second, to Sir James, heir of Sir George Kennedy of Dunure, by whom she was the mother of the distinguished patriotic statesman Bishop Kennedy—third, to William Lord Graham, by whom she was the mother of Bishop Graham—and fourth, to Sir William Edmonstone of Duntreath; and Elizabeth, married to Sir James Douglas of Dalkeith, from whom were descended the Douglasses, Earls of Morton. He had also two natural sons, James Stewart of Kilbride, and Sir John Stewart, who obtained from his father charters of Auchingowan and Ardgowan, and from whom are descended the Shaw Stewarts of Greenock, Blackhall, and Ardgowan.

CHAPTER II.

JAMES I. AND JAMES II.—THE ASSERTION OF
SOVEREIGNTY.

THESE two kings, characterised by much similarity of temper and abilities, were largely occupied in an endeavour to re-establish the authority of the sovereign, and to bring the whole kingdom under the dominion of uniform laws administered by government officials. Had they been able fully to carry out their purpose, it is more than likely that the subsequent tenor of Scottish history—politically and ecclesiastically—would have been widely different from what it turned out to be. It was partly frustrated by the fate which cut off both of them prematurely; by the long minorities following the death of both; and by the exceptional weakness of James III.

James I. was born about the end of July 1494, in the palace of Dunfermline—from the time of the Bruce the principal palace of the Scottish kings; while the neighbouring Abbey Church had, from the time of Malcolm Canmore, succeeded Iona as the place of royal sepulture. After his brother's death he was for greater safety transferred to the keeping of Bishop Wardlaw in the castle of St Andrews; but distrustful of his security in Scotland, his father finally caused him, in the spring of 1406, to be brought secretly to the Bass

Rock, where, in the beginning of March, he embarked in a vessel intended to convey him to France. By chance or treachery it was, however, captured by the English off Flamborough Head, and the boy was sent south to Henry IV., who resolved to place him under his own protection, whimsically remarking: "Assuredly had the Scots been polite they would have sent the young man to me for his education, for I also know French." The death shortly afterwards of Robert III. made the boy's detention in England a greater hardship than it might otherwise have been, but his forced absence from Scotland had also its compensations. The strict supervision exercised over him preserved him from various temptations; and to his years of captivity he probably owed not a little of his peculiar self-control and self-reliance, and the wariness and strong decision so disconcerting to those whose aims he found it desirable to thwart. The monotony of his environment and his aloofness from the gaiety and stir of the outside world might have injuriously affected the spirits of one less physically and mentally robust; but in his case the main effect of his imprisonment seems to have been to strengthen and, in some respects, to harden his character; while it also confirmed any studious tendencies he may have possessed. He acquired a wide acquaintance with the poetical literature of France and England, and himself essayed poetic composition. He also became an accomplished singer and a skilled player; and he was accustomed, even after he became king, to spend much time "yn synging and piping, yn harping and yn other honest solaces of grete pleasance and disporte." At the same time he was thoroughly interested in the affairs of the world and loved an active life. Though his captivity limited his opportunity for field sports, he was partial to such outdoor amusements as were within his reach. While not so tall as his father or grand-

father, he was very thick-set and possessed of great bodily vigour. Æneus Sylvanus—who saw him only after he had passed his fortieth year—while mentioning his robustness, represents him as rather corpulent; but he was agile and active in his earlier years, and specially excelled in throwing the hammer and in wrestling. His physical robustness was one of his assets as a sovereign. It especially tended in those times to enhance his personal popularity, and since it was conjoined with exceptional robustness of intellect and will, he speedily acquired a quite exceptional sovereign ascendancy.

The earlier years of his captivity were spent mainly in the Tower, but their monotony was occasionally varied by short sojourns in the country. We are not informed whether he had any companions of his own age; but a Scottish household was permitted him, and he was treated and cared for as a prince. When he reached the Tower he found already there his cousin Murdoch, Earl of Fife, captured at Homildon Hill in 1402; and at the accession of Henry V. in 1412, William Douglas of Dalkeith and William Giffard are also mentioned as fellow-prisoners with him. At the beginning of 1416 Albany succeeded in obtaining Murdoch's exchange for Henry, son of Hotspur; and his release, while James remained a prisoner, was, as we know from the letters of James, highly offensive to the eager young king. Still the improved relations with England tended to alleviate his circumstances. He was now placed under the charge of Sir John Pelham, and allowed more freedom of movement and a greater variety of diversion. In a letter urging that measures should be taken in Scotland for his release, he expressed his sense of his generous treatment by Henry V., who, he affirms, had been more gracious to him than he could say or write. Though he was for

some time a prisoner in Windsor, it is mere conjecture that he there first saw his future wife Jane Beaufort.

For some time Henry had apparently been meditating his liberation; but while between the two kings there may well have come to be a mutual liking and mutual respect—the respect which men of great ability and force of character feel for each other—they were separated in political sympathy by the gulf of the long dispute between the two nations. The greater the ability of James, the more important was it to be assured as to his intentions; and it was probably both with a view to win his fuller confidence and to impair the old alliance between the Scots and French that Henry in 1430 induced his royal captive to join him in his French campaign. It is asserted that Henry made the presence of their king in the English camp an excuse for hanging as rebels all the Scottish prisoners taken in battle; and, at least, he probably relied on the presence of the Scottish king in his camp to cause dubiety among the Scots. James also stretched a point in consenting that Archibald Douglas should serve Henry V. for life with 400 men; but he was not in a position to prevent such an agreement being made, and a consent while he was a prisoner could hardly be held binding. Leaving for France in July 1420, James was with Henry at Melun, and accompanied him in his triumphal entry into Paris on 1st December. He must have also returned to England with Henry and his newly-married queen, Catherine of France, for he was at Leicester when the court was there. After the defeat of the Duke of Clarence at Beaujè, he again accompanied Henry to France, and he was probably present at the death of the great king and conqueror at Bois de Vincennes, 2nd August 1422.

The death of Henry V. necessarily interfered with whatever arrangements may have been contemplated

for the release of the Scottish king, but an important Scottish Commission was finally appointed to treat with England for this purpose, and on 1st September 1423 a treaty was agreed on at York for his liberation, on payment of £4000 English money or 60,000 merks Scots, not in the strict sense as ransom, but for his maintenance in England, and on condition of his marriage to some high-born English lady. The money was to be paid in yearly instalments of 10,000 merks, one being remitted as marriage dowry.

Jane Beaufort, "the high-born English lady" whom he married, was the daughter of John, Earl of Somerset, the son of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, the fourth son of Edward III. Since James was in his thirtieth year, she must have been considerably younger than he. Shortly after the ceremony at St Mary Overy Church in Southwark, 12th February 1424, the royal couple set out on their journey to Scotland. At Durham, where they were met by the Scottish noblemen, who brought hostages for his deliverance, James, on 20th March, signed a treaty with England for seven years from 12th May following, to the effect that neither king—nor the subjects of either—was to assist the enemies of the other: a rather one-sided arrangement, for Scotland never had any special enemy but England. On 21st May the King and Queen were crowned at the historic Scone, Murdoch, Duke of Albany—he had succeeded his father in 1419—as Earl of Fife, placing the king on the throne, though that was no longer the ancient Stone of Destiny.

Unless we accept the references in the poem *The Kingis Quair* as a close record of facts, we have no information as to whether James had any acquaintance with Jane Beaufort before their affiance, though he may well have met her at the Court of Henry V. in the interval between the two French campaigns; and the

marriage clause in the treaty for his liberation may have been merely the result of an arrangement sketched out between the two kings before the death of Henry V. To *The Kingis Quair*, written ostensibly by the king in honour of his bride, the earliest reference is by John Major (d. 1469), who says of James I. : he "left behind him many writings and songs, which are to this day remembered amongst the Scots, and reckoned to be the best they have. He wrote an ingenious little book about the queen while he was yet in captivity, and before his marriage." Though referred to by later writers, nothing further was known of it until the discovery, in 1783, in the Bodleian Library, of a manuscript of *The Kingis Quair*, dated 1475, and attributing the poem to James I. On the ground of internal evidence the royal authorship of the poem was, in 1896, disputed by Mr J. T. T. Brown ; and Professor Lawson, in his edition of the *Quair* (1910), while disagreeing with Mr Brown's arguments, has for other reasons expressed strong doubts of its authenticity. On the other hand, if Professor Lawson has refuted Mr Brown, Professor Skeat's final verdict is adverse to the arguments of both. Here it may suffice to point out that while from lack of sufficient data for comparison with other writings, internal evidence is apt to be deceptive, the statement of Major, not removed more than a generation from James I., is very definite ; that the manuscript statement of so early a date as 1475 is strong corroborate testimony ; and that since James I. was a poet of high repute, the presumptive evidence is entirely in his favour, unless the internal evidence is clearly opposed to such a supposition. But, accepting the poem as his, the allusions to his captivity and deliverance may be largely figurative ; and, in any case, the lattice scene representing his first glimpse of the lady from the window of his prison is a mere variation of current

allegorical methods; though the poem, while distinguished by a special individual grace and felicity of diction, seems also to throb throughout with the passion of a personal experience.

In the *Gude and Godly Ballatis*, a short poem, *Sen throu Vertew encressis dignite*, is attributed to James; and John Major mentions as his an ingenious song, *Yas Sen*, which cannot now be identified, and *At Beltane*, i.e., *Peblis to the Play*, preserved in the Maitland MS.; while *Christis Kirk*, preserved in the Maitland and Bannatyne MSS., is attributed to him in the Bannatyne MS. The two last are so similar in tone and method that whoever wrote the one almost certainly must have written the other; and thus for the king's authorship of both poems we have practically the joint testimony of Major and the Bannatyne MS. It has been doubted whether, owing to his long residence in England, he could have had the mastery of Scots which they evidence, but it must be remembered that he had there a Scottish household. Further, certain letters of his have recently been discovered written in Scots; and Major definitely affirms that certain of his writings and songs were "reckoned by the Scots to be the best they have." They might well entertain this high opinion of *Peblis to the Play* and *Christis Kirk*, which still occupy a kind of unique place amongst old Scottish verse. While in their stave they exhibit a blend of the old ballad and the alliterative romance, they portray the amusements and manners of the common people, and this with a vividness and vitality that have made them the models of some of the most characteristic verse of Ramsay, Fergusson, and Burns. In their tone and manner they strikingly contrast with *The Kingis Quair*, but in the case of the greater poets such contrasts are not uncommon.

For his poetry alone James I. would be entitled to a

unique place among British sovereigns ; but his career as a ruler was also a remarkable one. That such a poet should have been such a sovereign may, also, at first sight seem wellnigh incredible ; but then James lived in quite a different age from ours ; and in regard to certain features of his rule which may cause perplexity to us, it may be pleaded that the characteristics of his disposition revealed in his verse entitle him to the benefit of the doubt. The enormous difficulties of the problem he had to solve must also be taken into account. The prevailing disorder and misrule which confronted him on his arrival in Scotland aroused his deep detestation ; and, as he put it, he was resolved, if God gave him "but a dog's life," to make "the key keep the castle and the bracken bush the cow throughout all Scotland." Had he as a sovereign been destitute of high ideals, had he been prepared to flatter and bribe the principal nobles as the two Albanys had done, and to leave the bulk of the nation to the tender mercies of their oppressors, he would not have needed to have recourse to the strenuous and violent methods which have proved a rock of offence to many ; but then his reign would have been a merely useless one, and if innocent of painful domestic occurrences would have been quite ineffective for good.

At the beginning of the reign we are faced by the stumbling-block of the execution of Albany and his sons. James had been less than two months in Scotland, and had not yet been crowned at Scone, when he thought fit to order the arrest of Albany's son, Sir Walter Stewart, of Albany's brother-in-law, Malcolm Fleming of Biggar, and of Thomas Boyd, younger of Kilmaurs. Meanwhile he permitted Albany himself to exercise the privilege of placing him on the throne at his coronation, and Albany's son Alexander received, on the same occasion, along with other twenty-seven nobles, the

honour of knighthood. At the close of the year, however, Albany's father-in-law Duncan, Earl of Lennox, and Sir Robert Graham, younger son of Sir Patrick Graham, were thrown into prison; and at a Parliament at Perth in March 1424-5, Albany himself and his son Alexander were suddenly arrested, as well as Lord Montgomery, and Alexander Otterburn, secretary of Albany. Thereupon Albany's son James did the opposite of good service to his father and his brothers by burning Dumbarton and slaying Sir John Stewart of Dundonald and thirty of the garrison, after which he fled to Ireland. On 26th May Albany's eldest son Walter was, in presence of the King, tried by an excise of twenty-six noblemen, condemned to death and executed the same day at the Heading Hill of Stirling; and next day Albany himself, his father-in-law Lennox, and his son Alexander were similarly disposed of. As regards the actual reasons for their sudden and dramatic doom, we have no further information than that they were accused "de roboria." This vague generality is all that has been recorded to account for one of the most sadly tragic stories of history,—the stern resolve of the king to put to death those of his relatives who were then the only heirs to the crown of the descendants of Robert II. by Elizabeth Muir. The inner secret of this terrible tragedy of family alienation has not been revealed; but we may not err greatly in tracing its beginning to the death of the Duke of Rothesay in Falkland. Robert III. had on this account come to entertain strong doubts of the safety of his second son James in Scotland, and it was to those doubts that James indirectly owed his long captivity in England. Probably, also, James was not convinced that Murdoch any more than his father had done his utmost to secure his liberation; and it is, moreover, undeniable that under neither father nor son had the

rule of the country been satisfactory. Then James had before him the stern work of freeing the country from the irresponsible domination of the nobles; and this made it incumbent to remove those round whom they might rally. By securing their immense estates and gaining control of their feudal dependants he, also, greatly strengthened his position as sovereign; but had he had perfect confidence in their loyalty to him this would have been unnecessary: it would have been an immense advantage to him could he have depended on their aid.

Doubt of the loyalty of Malise Graham, Earl of Strathearn—whose grandfather David was the eldest son of Robert II. by Euphemia Ross—was most likely the reason why he was deprived in 1427 of his estates, on the ground that it was a male fee, and sent as a hostage to England. As early as 1424 his uncle, Sir Robert Graham, had been thrown into prison, and though he had been liberated he was probably, and, as the sequel was to show, with good cause, regarded with suspicion. Another important confiscation was that, so late as 1434, of the Earldom of Dunbar, on the ground that it had been forfeited by the treasonable relations with England of the present earl's father, whose pardon in 1408 by the Regent Albany, James declined to recognise; but the reason of the forfeiture was the inability of James to trust in the perfect loyalty of a family closely related to the house of Lancaster.

Were there no other reasons for these strong proceedings, they might be attributed to merely selfish and tyrannical ambitions; but while they might, and did, imply a resolve to assert a kind of absolutism—the absolutism which was then everywhere else attached to sovereignty—they were also conjoined with the whole-hearted devotion of quite exceptional practical

abilities to the promotion of the nation's highest interests; and it was only by James asserting his authority as he did that his great practical purpose could be effected. The cardinal feature of his rule was his effort to bring the whole nation under the dominion of enlightened legislation. It was ordained that all the king's lieges should be governed "under the king's laws and statutes of the realm," and under "no particular law or special privilege." Means were also taken to secure that the laws should be just, adequate, and efficient. A committee of "six wise men" from each of the Estates was appointed to revise and amend the Books of Law; and it was ordained that all the statutes and ordinances of the Parliament should be published openly in the chief places of the sheriffdom and other notable places. James may therefore be regarded as the founder of the present Statute Law of Scotland.

But the efficiency of law depends on the efficiency of its administration. Judges were, therefore, specially warned against showing favour to the rich over the poor; and those unable to pay for an advocate to plead their cause were to have one provided for them, while if the judges refused "to do the law evenly," the party complaining might have direct recourse to the king, who would see all such judges "rigorously punished." The judges referred to were also an innovation of James: they were "officers and members of the law" appointed by the king throughout the realm to administer justice to the king's commons; and, in addition, a supreme court of law was instituted for the determination of complaints, causes, and quarrels brought before the king and council. To repress internal disorder laws were passed against internecine strife, leagues, and bands, refusal to help the king against rebels, and riding through the country with

an undue number of personal attendants. On the other hand, much attention was devoted to the military training of the nation. Wappinschawings were appointed to be held four times a-year; football was prohibited in order that all above twelve years of age might devote their Sunday afternoons to the practice of archery; and barons, burgesses, and seamen were ordered to provide themselves with arms.

Only a few samples of the comprehensive social legislation can be given. Public inns were instituted, where all strangers were required to lodge. Begging was prohibited in the case of all persons between fourteen and seventy years of age, except in the case of those who, for special reasons, were given a licence to beg; and every one who had "nocht of his own" and was able to work, was compelled to "labour for his living." The fees of wrights, masons, and others employed in towns were to be determined by the town council; and to "secure proper workmanship," a deacon of the craft was to be appointed for each town "to govern and assay all works that were made." Tillers of the soil, again, were compelled, on payment of a fine, to sow a certain amount and certain proportions of wheat, pease, and beans; a close time was proclaimed for salmon and wild-fowls; and the slaying of deer by "stalkers" was prohibited.

While, also, the general tendency of the policy of James I. was to strengthen the influence of the clergy in opposition to the great nobles, he was as zealous for efficiency in the ecclesiastical as in the secular administration. Though supporting them in their proceedings against heretics, including Paul Crawar, who was burned for heresy at St Andrews in 1433, he was a zealous reformer of ecclesiastical abuses. An Act passed in 1427 for the reform of the procedure in spiritual courts brought him into controversy with the

Pope; and the dispute was not settled before the death of James, though a nuncio was then in Scotland to effect a reconciliation. He also expressed his strong disapprobation of the condition of various religious houses; and in order to introduce a higher ideal of monastic life, founded a monastery for the Carthusians at Perth.

To carry out his plans for the reform of abuses and the establishment of his supremacy, James sought to magnify the Parliament or general council of the nation. It consisted of what was called the Three Estates: the nobles as barons being reckoned as one, the prelates another, and the freeholders a third. All the Estates met together: there was no second chamber; and influential though the great nobles were, they in numbers formed but an inconsiderable proportion of the whole assembly. The importance which James attached to the Parliament as a curb on the domination of the nobles, and as a consultative assembly in regard to the circumstances and needs of the people, is specially shown by an Act of 1425 which ordained that all prelates, earls, barons, and freeholders should appear in their proper persons and not by procurators; and when it was found difficult to secure a good attendance of the lesser barons, it was enacted that two or more wise men might be chosen for each sheriffdom to represent them; but how long this arrangement, which did not become permanent, continued, we have no information.

Nor was James content with Lowland reformatations; he was bent as well on making his sovereignty a reality throughout the Highlands and Islands. Unhappily this was not to be attained by gentle means; and without much scrupulosity he selected the means that were likely to be speediest, most effective, and least costly to himself. Like Cromwell, Napoleon, and other great and original rulers, he was, when faced with

political problems of exceptional difficulty, not pedantically strict about methods; and he did not hesitate to cut any hard political knot which he could not untie. Having in a friendly way summoned Alexander, Lord of the Isles, and the principal Highland chiefs to a Parliament at Inverness in the spring of 1427, he, immediately on their arrival there, arrested them and threw them into prison. Certain of them accused of heinous crimes were tried and executed; but many, including the Lord of the Isles, were liberated after a short imprisonment, in the hope that they would take warning from the fate of the other chiefs. Two years later the Lord of the Isles, in revenge of the indignity he had suffered, attacked and burnt Inverness; but shortly thereafter he was surprised and completely defeated by James at Lochaber. He himself escaped, but on the eve of the feast of St Augustine he appeared, in suppliant attitude and divested of his lordly apparel, before the king and court in front of the high altar at Holyrood Chapel, and in token of submission presented his sword to the king. Though his life was spared he was sent a prisoner to Tantallon; and his cousin, Donald Balloch, resenting his imprisonment, ravaged Lochaber with fire and sword, and after defeating the Earls of Mar and Caithness at Inverlochy, retreated to the Isles and passed over into Ireland. The king therefore resolved on an expedition to the Isles, but the flight of Donald having bereft the chiefs of any hope of resistance, they presented themselves as suppliants before him at Dunstaffnage, when not only did he refrain from punishing them, but shortly afterwards granted liberty and full pardon to the Lord of the Isles, who ever afterwards remained loyal.

The marriage of James to an English princess did not, in the end, lead to happier relations between the two nations. The continued occupation of Berwick

and Roxburgh by the English was a barrier to this. A treaty, concluded 17th July 1428, for a marriage between the Dauphin and the king's daughter Margaret, led to a visit in May 1429 of Cardinal Beaufort to Scotland; and on 1st July the treaty with England was renewed. Later, on condition that James would agree to a perpetual peace, England offered to restore the castles of Berwick and Roxburgh; but James declined to accept them on terms that implied treachery to France. On this account, and in resentment of the matrimonial negotiations with France, an English force in 1435 invaded Scotland, but was severely defeated at Piperden by the Earl of Mar. Followed an attempt in 1436 to intercept the king's daughter Margaret on her voyage to France, which provoked James to lay siege to Roxburgh Castle; but on the arrival of the queen in the camp on the fifteenth day of the siege, he, for reasons which have not been revealed, broke up the siege and returned to Edinburgh.

Had the reign of James now reached a critical period? He had achieved, with whatever difficulty, by whatever means, and at whatever cost, a great temporary success. Opposition to his will had, meanwhile, been quelled both in the Highlands and Lowlands; he had greatly strengthened the buttresses of sovereignty; and he had passed laws and established an executive for the extinction of oppression, the prevention of strife and disorder, and the comprehensive promotion of the nation's wellbeing. But had he been merely sowing the wind, and was the reaping of the whirlwind sooner or later inevitable? Some do not hesitate to affirm that this was so, that his untimely fate was the inevitable result of his violent ardour as a reformer: "his wholesale forfeiture of the nobles estates," says one modern authority, "led to his ruin." As matter of fact, however, the conspiracy by which

his assassination was effected had no national or widespread basis. It was essentially dynastic; it was wholly contrived by the descendants of Euphemia Ross, second wife of Robert II., who claimed to be legitimate heirs to the crown. The exact circumstances that led to it have been insufficiently recognised. By ridding himself of his male-heirs descended from Elizabeth Muir, James necessarily increased his peril from the descendants of Euphemia Ross. That peril did not, however, become menacing until the birth of a son to James in 1430 ousted the Earl of Atholl from his place as next heir to the crown. Sir Robert Graham, the ultimate assassin of James, may after the execution of Albany and his sons have been quite loyally inclined. Though, also, the forfeiture of his nephews' estates in 1427 may have deeply offended him, the liferent of the property had been bestowed on the Earl of Atholl. James had always taken care to treat Atholl with consideration; he had received his grandson, Sir Robert Stewart, into his household, and ultimately made him chamberlain. Most likely he had devoted special care to the young man's training and education, in view of the possibility that he might succeed him as king. But the survival of a son to James I. overthrew the hopes of Atholl and his grandson: it removed all worldly motives of loyalty to James in the case either of them or Sir Robert Graham. The story, derived from a paper of dubious origin, that as late as 1435 Graham denounced the tyranny of James in the Parliament, and appealed to the barons to lay him under personal restraint;—this story is in itself hardly credible, but had he done so, his doom, most likely, would not have been merely banishment, as stated, but execution. If, however, James did manifest this special leniency to Graham, it proved a fatal misjudgment.

Notwithstanding, it is said, the warnings of a High-

land spaewife against crossing the Forth, James resolved to pass his Christmas and some subsequent weeks in the cloister of the Blackfriars, Perth. He had been spending the evening of 21st February 1436-7 with his more intimate friends in reading romances, in hearing music, and in games of chess, when shortly after they had left, and he was about to retire for the night, Graham, by the treachery of Sir Robert Stewart, brought a band of armed followers into the monastery. How far the reported details of the assassination are correct is difficult to tell; but it would appear that James, after taking refuge in a small closet, made a desperate fight for life until he received a fatal blow from the sword of Graham. His breast is said to have been pierced by no fewer than thirteen wounds, and his perforated doublet, kept as a relic in the Carthusian monastery, bore testimony to this. The story that Catherine Douglas delayed the entrance of the assassins by barring the door of the apartment with her arm is of late origin, so far as the testimony of extant documents is concerned.

The sequel showed how little Graham represented the sentiments of the nation. There were no signs of national joy at deliverance from a tyrant. Nor did any rising take place on behalf of Atholl. Instead of finding himself a national hero, Graham had to take refuge in the Highland fastnesses; but he found even there but little sympathy, and was traced to his hiding-place by two Highland chiefs. The guilt of Atholl, who was seized by Angus, cousin of the late king, was either proved or taken for granted, and indeed the purpose of the conspirators was evident enough. The barbarities that adorned their execution were of an extreme kind even for that age, but seem to have harmonised with the vehement sentiments of national execration aroused by the murder.

The sudden death of this great king before he could witness the full fruition of his remarkable statesmanship is an exceptionally sad instance of the ironical freaks of fate. Had he been spared to reach a good old age, he might have left such an impression of his influence as, conjoined with the immediate co-operation of his son, would have greatly changed the complexion of Scottish history; and, as it is, the consequences of his statesmanship may be traced not only in the reigns of his immediate successors, but during several subsequent centuries. He did much to break the power of the ancient feudalism; he placed the sovereignty on a new and firmer footing; and even although some of his successors were too weak or too foolish to turn to their proper advantage, or the proper advantage of the nation, the heritage he had left them, that heritage still, in a fashion, survived their failures and the strange political and ecclesiastical convulsions through which the country was yet to pass.

James was buried in the convent of the Carthusians, Perth. His heart was sent on a pilgrimage to the East, and in 1443 it was brought back by a knight of St John, who presented it to the Carthusians. His wife bore him twin sons—Alexander, who died in infancy, and James, who succeeded him. Several of the daughters inherited his literary tastes. They were Margaret, married to the Dauphin, afterwards Louis XI., who also, like his wife, wrote verses; Elizabeth or Isabel—who is credited with the authorship of two French verses on the death of her sister Margaret, printed in Francisque-Michel's *Les Écossais en France*, i. 193—married to Francis, Duke of Brittany; Joan or Janet, who, although born dumb, became the wife of James Douglas of Dalkeith, afterwards Earl of Morton; Eleanor, who married the Archduke Sigismund of Austria, and translated into German a French romance;

Mary, married to Wilfram van Borselen, Count of Grandprè, and Lord Campvere in Zealand; and Annabella, who was rejected by Louis, Count of Geneva, after she had gone as his betrothed wife to France, and in 1459 was married to George, second Earl of Huntly.

Born on 16th October 1430, James II. was at the time of his father's assassination but in his seventh year. Immediately after it the queen returned to Edinburgh, and with her children took up her residence in the Castle, of which Sir William Crichton was governor. On 25th March the king was crowned in the Abbey of Holyrood. His custody fell to his mother, and the regency was conferred on the king's cousin, Archibald, Earl of Douglas — this although he had married Euphemia, daughter of Sir Patrick Graham.

The queen, as she had a perfect right to do, now transferred her son—whether, as Boece states, surreptitiously or not, by placing him in a wardrobe chest—to her jointure-house of Stirling Castle, commanded by Sir Alexander Livingstone of Callendar. Shortly thereafter Livingstone, authorised by a convention held at Stirling, laid siege to Edinburgh Castle, but Crichton came to terms with him, Crichton obtaining the Chancellorship in succession to Bishop Cameron, while the king and queen were to remain under Livingstone's protection in Stirling Castle. The passive Earl of Douglas died of fever on 26th June 1439, but no new regent was appointed, matters being allowed to drift until the marriage of the queen to Sir James Stewart, the Black Knight of Lorn. Thereupon Livingstone, on the ground that her marriage was a breach of her trust as the young king's guardian, on 3rd April placed her, her husband and his brother, in strict ward in the castle; and at a general convention at Stirling, on 4th September, she resigned the custody of her son, until his majority, to Livingstone, with 4000 merks for

his maintenance. Henceforth the august widow of the late king, the immortal heroine of *The King's Quair*, ceased to be of much account in the country of her adoption; but after her death, 15th July 1445, her obsequies were performed "according to her degree," and she was buried beside James I. in the Carthusian monastery, Perth. By the Knight of Lorn she had three sons: John Stewart of Balveny, created Earl of Atholl, from whom the ducal family of Atholl are descended in the female line; James Stewart, Earl of Buchan, "heartly James," from whom the Erskines, Earls of Buchan, are descended in the female line; and Andrew, who became Bishop of Moray.

Jealous of the power of Livingstone as now sole custodian of the king, Crichton kidnapped the boy in Stirling Park and carried him to Edinburgh; but the danger to both from the young Earl of Douglas, who had claims to the regency and the custody of the king, caused a reconciliation between them, followed by a plot for the assassination of Douglas and his brother. Next to Malise Graham, still a hostage in England for the unpaid ransom of James I., Douglas was the nearest heir to the crown by descent from Euphemia Ross; he was also a near heir by descent from the eldest daughter of Robert III.; and he was the grand-nephew of Sir Robert Graham, the murderer of James I. Clearly, therefore, Crichton and Livingstone were in a difficult dilemma, not merely on their own account but on that of the king, a fact which must be taken into account in judging of the violent device by which, in the opinion of many to their immitigable infamy, they preserved themselves in power. Having, on 22nd November 1440, lured within Edinburgh Castle the young Earl and his brother, and their friend and counsellor old Malcolm Fleming of Cumbernauld, they took care that they should not again leave it alive. If they were

formally tried, the trial could not be a legal one ; but the story, recorded by Boece, that the death of the two brothers was cruelly foreshown them by the appearance at the dinner-table of a bull's head, and other details meant to heighten the unfeeling and wicked culpability of the two governors, are on the face of them apocryphal. They may have formed part of the ballad, evidently by a Douglas partisan, of which only one, seemingly the last, verse has been preserved by the historian of the family :—

“ Edinburgh Castle, tower and town,
 God grant ye sink for sin ;
 And even for the black dinner
 Lord Douglas gat therein.”

While the Galloway estates passed to the sister of the murdered earl, who was a mere child, the Earldom of Douglas was inherited by James the Gross, a Falstaffian personage who had an easy facility for regulating his conduct according to his interests, and had almost as great cause as Crichton and Livingstone to dread the young Douglas, for during his hot youth he had slain Sir David Fleming, father of their friend Malcolm Fleming. Soon after his death, in 1443, Livingstone joined his son, the eighth earl, in an attempt to oust Crichton, who, while retaining Edinburgh Castle, was deprived of the Chancellorship. It was bestowed on the king's uncle, Bishop Kennedy of St Andrews, whereupon Douglas stirred up the Earl of Crawford to ravage his diocese ; but the bishop, by retorting with the weapon of excommunication, soon brought Crawford to terms. Followed a close compact between Kennedy and Crichton, who was restored to the Chancellorship ; and their co-operation did much to minimise the evils of the king's minority.

On 3rd July 1449 the king was married to Mary of Gueldres. Up till then Douglas had been on friendly and even intimate terms with him; and on 10th September of that year Livingstone was one of the commissioners who signed a treaty with England; but shortly afterwards occurred what the *Auchinleck Chronicle* terms "a great ferlie." Before a Parliament at Edinburgh, 19th January 1449-50, Livingstone and his near relatives were arraigned for treason. Alexander his younger son and Robert Livingstone the Comptroller were executed, while Sir Alexander and other relatives were attainted and imprisoned. Douglas received a share of the forfeited estates, but during his absence at a jubilee celebration at Rome in 1450, the king, on account of disturbances in his territories, captured certain of his fortresses. Nevertheless on his making formal submission, he was confirmed in his office of Warden of the Marches; and ultimately an ostensible reconciliation took place between him and the king, at which, remarks the *Auchinleck Chronicle*, all Scotsmen were glad. Soon, however, it became manifest that Douglas and his eldest brother were being tampered with by England, and it cannot be doubted that Douglas, along with his old ally, the Earl of Crawford, was meditating a great coup against the king. It was a kind of revival of the old peril from the descendants of Euphemia Ross, for Douglas had married the "Fair Maid of Galloway," daughter of the fifth earl by Euphemia Graham; and Crawford, whose aunt had married the executed earl, was also a descendant of a daughter of Robert II. by his second wife.

As soon as the king got intimation of the hostile purpose of Douglas and Crawford, he sent Douglas an invitation to visit him in Stirling Castle, and with the invitation a safe-conduct. The invitation Douglas accepted, but if an Act of Parliament is to be relied

on, he, on arriving at Stirling, renounced the safe-conduct, which he may have done on the ground that it reflected on his loyalty. On Fastern's E'en, 22nd February 1451-2, he was entertained by the king at supper, after which they withdrew from the general company to an inner chamber. The old intimacy between them deepens the sadness and horror of the sensational deed by which James II.—James with the fire mark on his face—made his special *début* on the stage of history. The recorded details of the quarrel may be partly guesswork; but if James 'did demand of Douglas that he should break his band with Crawford, he was even treating Douglas with more consideration than he deserved; and the insulting insolence of the earl's refusal might have more than tried the patience of any manful sovereign. In any case it roused the demon in James II., who suddenly stabbed him with his dagger, after which it is said an attendant, rushing in, dashed out his brains with a pole-axe.

Shortly afterwards the king set out to Perth to take measures against Crawford; and during his absence the dead earl's eldest brother James appeared at Stirling with his brother Hugh, Earl of Ormond, James Lord Hamilton—who had married Eupheme, widow of the fifth Earl of Douglas, and the mother of the "Fair Maid of Galloway"—and a force of 600 men, and dragged—so the *Auchinleck Chronicle* picturesquely, but it may be fancifully, affirms—the safe-conduct at his horse's tail through the streets, and then burned and pillaged the town. Moving eastward, he then attempted to attack Dalkeith Castle, occupied by the loyal James Douglas, who was married to the king's aunt; and failing in this, he laid waste the surrounding country. After the rout of Crawford at Brechin on 18th May by the king's lieutenant, Huntly, a Parliament was summoned to meet at Edinburgh in June.

On the night before it met Douglas placarded the door of the hall with a cartel of defiance; but both he and Crawford were attainted; and when the king assembled at Pentland Muir a force of 30,000 against him, his effrontery suddenly evaporated. Without an attempt at resistance, he put his signature to a very comprehensive renunciation of his enmity and arrogance. Thereupon the king received him into favour: at the king's request the Pope granted a dispensation for his marriage to his brother's widow, the "Fair Maid of Galloway," and he was one of the commissioners appointed, 11th April 1453, to conclude a truce with England. In the spring of the same year the king received the submission of Crawford, who died not long afterwards.

The king's policy of generosity proved, however, a mistaken one. On certain conditions Douglas had received large promises from England, and he procured from it the release of his wife's relative, Malise of Strathearn, the heir to the claims of the descendants of Euphemia Ross; but before he had completed his plans James, in the early summer of 1455, descended with a strong force on the Douglas country. Stronghold after stronghold fell rapidly into his hands, and his triumphant progress so dismayed Douglas's chief ally, Lord Hamilton, that while the king was besieging Abercorn Castle he came and made his submission. The three younger brothers of Douglas were routed near what is now known as Langholm, by a force of loyal Borderers, Moray being slain and Ormond captured. Where Douglas himself now was "no man wit"; but some time before his followers had given up the struggle he fled to England, where, on 15th July, he received a grant of £500 yearly, "till he was restored to his territory or the greater substance taken from him, by him who calls himself the King of Scots,"—a

significant sign that Douglas denied the title of James II. to the Scottish crown.

The overthrow of Douglas deprived the Stewart sovereignty and Scottish independence of a great immediate peril; and if perilous possibilities still remained, they were greatly lessened by the policy of James II. towards the younger branch of the family. There was a certain truth, if some exaggeration, in the old rhyme—

“A Douglas could not have been brought so low
Had not a Douglas wrought his overthrow.”

Besides conferring on George, 4th Earl of Angus, the Lordship of Douglas, James in 1458 gave his sister Joanna in marriage to James, 3rd Lord Dalkeith, whom he created Earl of Morton; but following the policy of his father, he annexed to the crown Ettrick Forest and the Lordship of Galloway, as well as the estates of the younger brothers of Douglas. By these and other annexations he placed himself in a position of unexampled authority. Certain castles—Edinburgh, Stirling, Dumbarton, Inverness, and Urquhart—were also joined in perpetuity to the crown; and it was further declared that the crown lands could not be alienated, and that if they were they might be resumed without intervention of legal processes. A statute appointing official uniforms for the secular members of the Estates—earls, barons, and commissioners of burghs respectively—indicates also a desire to magnify the Parliament as the indispensable ally of the sovereign in advancing the nation's welfare. The beneficent legislation of his father was considerably supplemented by him; and additional reforms were introduced in the administration of justice, including the institution of circuit courts of civil justice to meet twice a-year in Edinburgh, Perth, and Aberdeen. There is no infor-

mation as to his literary proclivities. The establishment of the University of Glasgow by Bishop Turnbull in 1451 was probably due to the rivalry between its see and that of St Andrews, where a university had been established in 1414; but there is evidence of his special interest in the College of St Salvator's, founded by his uncle Bishop Kennedy in 1450. If as zealous as his father in strengthening the prerogatives of the sovereign, the beneficent purpose of his reign is quite as manifest; and its outstanding feature is its triumphant success. He owed much to his father's achievement and example; but he had perils to meet which during his father's reign remained undeveloped, and meeting them with consummate courage and decision, he dealt with them in a manner that was completely effective.

To the arrogant message of Henry VI. [or Richard of York] in answer to a remonstrance against the shelter given to Douglas, James replied in 1456 by ravaging Northumberland; but England was then in a too divided state to retaliate; and after the dismissal of the Yorkist Ministry in October, a truce was signed 6th July 1457, to last for two years. After its expiry peace was observed until the capture of Henry VI., 10th July 1460, by the Yorkists. As they specially favoured the exiled Douglas, James recommenced hostilities by laying siege to Roxburgh Castle; and while, on 3rd August, watching—"more curious," says Pitscottie, "than became the majestie of ane king"—the firing of a bombard, it burst, and a splinter from it killed him on the spot.

James II. was buried in the Abbey of Holyrood. By Mary of Gueldres—who survived till 1463, and was buried in Trinity College Church, which she founded—he had four sons: James, who became James III., Alexander, Duke of Albany, David, Earl of Moray, who

died young, and John, Earl of Mar. The daughters were Mary, married first to Thomas Boyd, Earl of Arran, and afterwards to Sir James Hamilton of Cadzow, Lord Hamilton, a marriage which subsequently made the Hamiltons near heirs to the crown; and Margaret, regarding a scandalous story of whose relations with her brother James III. see specially a note by the late Mr Lang in his *History of Scotland*, vol. i. pp. 359-60.

CHAPTER III.

JAMES III. AND JAMES IV.—SAUCHIEBURN AND
FLODDEN.

FOUR days after the tragic death of her husband the queen arrived with her children at Roxburgh Castle, which shortly afterwards surrendered; and on 10th August James III., born 10th June 1451, was crowned king at Kelso. The dangers of the early minority were mitigated by the fact that the chief control of affairs was in the hands of Bishop Kennedy. Though the intrigues of the frail and fickle queen-dowager caused Kennedy some anxiety, they helped for a while to modify the Yorkist hostility. Edward IV. had rather chimerically projected that Douglas should exercise a subordinate sovereignty over the southern portion of Scotland, and the Lord of the Isles and his uncle Donald Balloch over the country north of the Forth; but he was diverted from his purpose by a proposed marriage between him and the Scottish queen-dowager; and in June Douglas was sent south to St Albans, "a sorrowful and sore-rebuked man."

In these projects the main aim of Edward IV. was to prevent the Scots interfering against him in England. The Scots, again, were anxious to utilise the dynastic quarrels in England to secure Berwick-on-Tweed, and in the hope of this granted Henry VI. and Margaret of

Anjou shelter in Scotland. After they crossed into Scotland, in April 1461, Margaret proceeded for aid to France, whence she landed in October on the coast of Northumberland with a small force. The efforts of the Scots to assist her met with no success; but though Douglas was now let loose on Scotland he acted with his usual ineffectiveness, and was easily defeated, his brother John, Lord Balveny, being also captured and executed. The dispersion of the Lancastrians before Warwick in July 1463, and the conclusion in the autumn by Edward IV. of a treaty with France, caused Kennedy to send Henry VI. to join his supporters in Northumberland; and in December the Scots concluded a treaty with Edward IV. which on 3rd June 1464 was extended for fourteen years. On the death of Mary of Gueldres, 1st December 1463, Kennedy was left in undisturbed possession of supreme authority, and the country was untroubled by faction until his death in July 1465.

The removal of Bishop Kennedy left Scotland without a political pilot. The young king's guardianship would have now naturally devolved on the Bishop's brother, Lord Kennedy, but he allowed himself to be made a tool of by Lord Boyd, who having, on certain promises, secured by a band the support of several influential nobles, enticed the king from Linlithgow to Edinburgh Castle, where he placed him under the charge of his brother, Sir Alexander Boyd. Then, at a meeting of the Estates in October, the king made his appearance, accompanied by Lord Boyd, and declared that he had been brought to Edinburgh at his own special request, whereupon the Estates appointed Lord Boyd governor of the person of the king and his brothers, as well as of the fortresses of the kingdom. If rashly ambitious, Lord Boyd was a just, able, and enlightened ruler; but his position was precarious, and

its peril was if anything augmented by the methods to which he had recourse to render it secure. Almost at once he arranged for the marriage of the king's sister Mary to his eldest son Thomas, who received an extensive grant of crown lands, including Arran, of which he was created earl. On the death of one of his co-conspirators, Lord Livingstone, he also appointed himself in 1468 to the office of Great Chamberlain; and he, further, gave his daughter in marriage to Archibald, fifth Earl of Angus ["Bell-the-Cat"].

A new band, signed by the Bishops of Glasgow and Aberdeen, the Earl of Argyll, and others, may indicate the suspicion of some movement against him; but he may well have hoped much from his promotion of the marriage of the king to the Princess Margaret of Denmark. The chief envoy in the negotiations was his son, the Earl of Arran, reputed of high ability and great personal charm. By the treaty the long-standing dispute regarding the Norway "annual" for the Western Isles of Scotland was settled; and the Orkneys and Shetlands, assigned as pledge of part of the queen's dowry, remained henceforth in the possession of Scotland. In July 1469 Arran brought the bride to Scotland, and shortly afterwards the marriage was celebrated at Holyrood, the king being eighteen and Margaret thirteen years of age. But from the brilliant assemblage the Boyds were notable absentees, for all their high fortunes and hopes had been in a moment overwhelmed in irretrievable ruin.

Before he arrived in Scotland a warning was conveyed to Arran by his wife of his imminent danger, and he returned along with her to Denmark in the ship in which he had sailed with his royal charge to Scotland. Lord Boyd was also warned in time to make his escape to England, but Sir Alexander was detained in Scotland by illness. Both were, at a Parliament in

November, found guilty of treason in carrying off the king, and Sir Alexander was executed. The cause of their fall was jealousy of their power, and especially of the marriage of Arran to the king's sister. Proceedings were taken for his divorce from her; and some time afterwards she was married to Lord Hamilton.

The Boyds being got rid of, the external omens for a successful reign were meanwhile auspicious. For a time Scotland was blessed with a period of tranquillity rare in her troubled annals. The ascendancy of the Douglasses had been overcome, and the truce with England had rendered innocuous the confederacy between Douglas and the Lord of the Isles. Though the latter—who was declared to have forfeited his life—still continued to skulk in his remote dominions, he was meanwhile impotent for evil; and being ultimately in 1475 doubly assailed—on the one side by Argyll, and on the other by Atholl and Crawford—he, on the persuasion of his relative Huntly, appeared on 15th June before Parliament as a suppliant, when he obtained the restoration of the greater part of his estates, with the exception of the Earldom of Ross, which was annexed to the crown.

The ecclesiastical quarrel caused by the erection of the see of Bishop Graham of St Andrews into an archbishopric does not here call for more than bare mention. It led to strong and persistent protests to the Pope by the king and clergy as to the fitness of Graham for his position, which, whether justifiably or not, led to a sentence of deprivation against him, 9th July 1477-8, when the king promoted his favourite astrologer, Schevas, to the vacant see. The political difficulties of the king, which in the end were to prove fatal to him, began with his brothers. Many kings have had similar difficulties. Edward IV., for example, the English contemporary of James III.,

quarrelled mortally with his brother Clarence. While, also, Robert III. became suspicious of his brother Albany's intentions, neither of the two predecessors of James III. had brothers to trouble them. James I. speedily got quit of those near relatives whom he deemed most dangerous, and James II. was not troubled in this way at all. So far as official evidence points, the cause of the rupture between James III. and his brother Albany was abuse of his power as Lieutenant of the Marches. This was the excuse for his imprisonment in Edinburgh Castle, and about the same time Mar was sent to Craigmillar. On the one hand, it is asserted that they were imprisoned because of treasonable designs against the king, and, on the other, it is affirmed that the king's favourites dreaded their influence with the nobility and desired their ruin. Both statements may be true; one of them may, and neither of them may. A tradition that the king dreaded Mar's magical arts may have originated in a blundering confusion of other rumours, though his sudden death in prison was bound to give rise to very sombre surmises and suspicions. The statement of Bishop Elphinstone—who was then official of Lothian—that he had been bled by a surgeon for fever and in his delirium tore off the bandages, may or may not be true. The Bishop merely relates what he had been officially told.

But if Mar met with foul play, Albany avoided the worst kind of possibilities by a daring escape from prison. The dare-devil feat affords us a vivid glimpse of the wilder aspects of those savage and stern times. We are transported back to the Edinburgh of the fifteenth century, when the city was thrilled by the news of a bloody tragedy on the previous night in one of the rooms of the castle. Pitscottie's version of the night's doings—a picturesque masterpiece—is evidently

founded on the discoveries in the castle that morning, which very soon must have become the talk of the town. According to him, the watchman beholding, as the day began to dawn, the sheets of a bed with a rope attached to it dangling over the castle wall, went to inform the captain of the castle; but not finding him in his chamber, he passed to the Duke's chamber and found the door open, a dead man lying at the chamber door, and the captain and the rest burning in the fire. Here we have the exaggeration of popular rumour, though one or two may have fallen on the fire as they met their mortal wounds; and the graphic narrative of the night's doings in the gruesome death-chamber—the carousing of Albany with the captain and his men until they became helpless, the piling of the dead bodies on the fire, the escape over the castle walls, the fall of the attendant on account of the shortness of the rope, the flight of Albany towards Newhaven with his hurt attendant on his broad shoulders, &c.,—much of this, whether the tale of a balladist or Pitscottie's own narrative from traditional gossip, is merely picturesque inference. On arriving in France, Albany was well received by Louis XI., and he married Anne de la Tour, daughter of Bertrand, Count of Boulogne and Auvergne.

Meanwhile, Angus in 1480 made a raid on the Borders, and, fearing the consequences, the king, after an unsuccessful appeal to Louis for help, sought to obtain a renewal of the truce with England. But although, as early as 1474, a marriage had been arranged between the young prince of Scotland and a daughter of Edward IV., the tune of Edward had now completely changed. He instructed his ambassadors to demand (1) the homage of the King of Scots to him as lord paramount; (2) the restoration of Berwick, Coldingham, Roxburgh, and “other the king's lands in

England"; (3) the deliverance of the Prince of Scotland within English ground; and (4) the restoration of the Earl of Douglas; and, failing the acceptance of these astounding proposals, they were to intimate that "in averting the effusion of Christian blood," Edward would be content with the deliverance of the Prince of Scots and Berwick. These conditions being rejected, Edward, in the spring of 1481, sent a fleet to ravage the coast of Fife, where it had, however, the worst of the encounter. James also gathered a large army, but when about to cross the Borders was induced to forego his purpose by the remonstrances of the Papal nuncio, though, on learning that Edward IV. meditated the invasion of Scotland, the Estates in March 1481-2 made arrangements for the country's defence against him, whom they termed "the revare Edward, calland himself the King of England"; and a high reward was also offered for the capture of the Earl of Douglas.

Meanwhile Edward IV. had been in communication with Albany, who, as "Alexander of Scotland by the gift of the King of England," signed on 10th June an agreement binding himself, if placed on the Scottish throne by English aid, to do homage to Edward as his suzerain; to break the league with France, and to surrender to Edward Berwick, Lochmaben, Eskdale, and Annandale. Edward IV. now assembled a force of 10,000 men under Richard, Duke of Gloucester—afterwards Richard III.—which, accompanied by Albany, laid siege to Berwick. Against the army of 50,000 with which James now proceeded south, the English force could have had no chance; but the gathering resentment of the bulk of the nobles—sympathisers most of them with Albany—at the low-born persons who were usurping their place in the king's favour, reached its climax when they found that Cochrane, the king's architect, now possessed of the

Earldom of Mar, was in command of the artillery. The gorgeous military apparel of the upstart favourite, his splendid pavilion, his high pomp and state, his supercilious bearing, and, in woeful contrast with this, the sudden ignominy of his doom, — is not all this most graphically, if in part fancifully, set forth in the Chronicle of Lyndsay of Pitscottie? Here it may suffice to state that the nobles, after hanging Cochrane and other favourites in makeshift fashion over Lauder Bridge, disbanded the army, and conducting the king to Edinburgh, shut him up in the castle.

It might well seem to the English that the nobles had removed all obstacles to the succession of Albany to the Scottish throne as the puppet of Edward IV.; but, apparently, all that they intended to secure, and all that they did secure, was Albany's return to Scotland. If Albany had cherished hopes of effecting in his own interest a kind of foreign conquest of his country, he found it as impossible as did Coriolanus to make the attempt. His march to Edinburgh along with Gloucester became a mere demonstration to enable him to come to terms with his brother. Edward, it is true, got back Berwick-on-Tweed, but he had to be content with this and the return of the money advanced for his daughter's dowry. His views on the situation are given in a letter to the Pope, which, it may be, conceals as much as it reveals. He announced that he had dealt leniently with the Scots, because Albany was of opinion that he (Albany) "would be much more welcome" if this was done "for his sake," and that he was now specially desirous to observe a peaceable policy towards the Scots, since he hoped Albany would so influence them "that henceforth they would observe treaties with us more steadily than is their wont."

Meanwhile, the king having been suspended from

the functions of sovereignty, negotiations were opened up with Albany through the Archbishop of St Andrews and the Bishop of Dunkeld. On condition of returning to his allegiance, Albany was to be restored to his lands; and a treaty to this effect was signed at Edinburgh on 2nd August between, on the one hand, Albany, and on the other the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Bishop of Dunkeld, the Earl of Argyll, and the Chancellor, Lord Avondale. Neither Angus nor other of the principals in the Lauder exploit had any discernible share in the negotiations: having played their strong and violent part, they vacated the stage for other performers, and Albany appeared as his brother's heroic ally and deliverer. After laying formal siege to Edinburgh Castle, he in due course received its surrender from the king's half-uncles, the Earls of Buchan and Atholl, to whose custody the king had been entrusted by the Lauder lords. Definite details of the fiasco are wanting; but however slight cause the king had to expect any special favour from the hands of his brother, he, whether temporarily deluded or not, besides establishing Albany in his estates, sanctioned the conferment on him of the Earldom of Mar—lately held by Cochrane—for his “service in besieging Edinburgh Castle and delivering the king from bondage to the peril of his life.” Albany being also appointed by the Parliament Lieutenant-General of the kingdom, the king had meanwhile no option but to submit to his ostentatious patronage. But Albany was not content with this. In January 1482-3 he empowered Lord Gray and Sir James Liddell of Halkerstone to treat with Edward IV. for aid in obtaining the throne of Scotland, while Angus—who, having married a daughter of Lord Boyd, could hardly be well inclined to the king—entered into a separate arrangement with the

exiled Douglas about the latter's restoration to his estates. Their intrigues becoming, however, prematurely known, they were fain to sign, on 16th March, an agreement by which, in consideration of pardon, they renounced their unlawful league with Edward IV. Albany further undertook to procure the renewal of the betrothal of the Princess Cecilia to Prince James; and he declared the report he had spread of the king's design to poison him to be a baseless fabrication. While deprived of the lieutenant-generalship he was to retain the wardship of the marches, and Angus and others were to retain their offices; but neither Albany, nor Angus, nor Buchan were to come within six miles of the king. After fortifying his castle of Dunbar, Albany returned to England to resume his old intrigues; but the death of Edward IV. —9th April 1483—prevented their development, and on 2nd June he was condemned and forfeited. On 22nd July 1484 he and Douglas, hoping to rally round them the discontented nobles, made their appearance at Lochmaben fair with five hundred horsemen, but were set upon and routed—Douglas being taken prisoner and Albany barely making his escape to Carlisle. The fiasco decided Richard III. to get rid of Albany, who passed to France, where, while witnessing a tournament feat at Paris, he was killed by the splinter of a lance. The old sentence on Douglas was commuted to confinement for life in Lindores Abbey, whereupon he is said to have remarked that he who can do no better must be a monk; and such a sad expression of failure may well have been wrung from him, when he recalled the monotonous ineffectiveness of his career and the miserable termination of his grandiose ambitions.

With the death of Albany and the imprisonment of Douglas it might well seem to James III. that his

domestic difficulties were at an end. A truce was, on 21st September 1484, arranged for three years with England, and a marriage was projected between Prince James and Lady Anne Suffolk, niece of Richard III. The defeat and death of Richard at Bosworth, 27th August 1485, put an end to this purpose; but on 3rd July 1486 a truce of three years was arranged with Henry VII., Berwick to remain neutral. Subsequently—Margaret, wife of James III. having died—a marriage was contracted between himself and Elizabeth, widow of Edward IV. and mother-in-law of Henry VII., while Prince James and his brothers were to be married to her daughters, sisters to the queen of Henry VII. An undertaking to this effect was signed by the Snowdon and Carlisle heralds, 21st November 1487; on 24th January 1487-8 there was to be a conference for the adjustment of terms, and the two kings were to have an interview in the following July; but negotiations were suspended, and in the end frustrated, by the crisis which brought about the tragic death of the Scottish king.

On the face of them these marriage proposals were praiseworthy enough, and their accomplishment might have saved the country much strife and bloodshed; but it may be that in entering upon them James was influenced less by high patriotic motives than by desire to protect himself against the unruly nobles, and to be at full leisure to devote himself to the luxurious enjoyment of his artistic pursuits. As Pitscottie puts it, he “delighted more in music and policy and building than he did in the government of his realm.” Pitscottie further remarks that he was “more diligent in conquessing money nor the hearts of his subjects.” The Lord Treasurer’s Accounts also show that he spent large sums on jewellery and

on ornamental utensils and other elaborate works in gold and silver; and in order to carry out the architectural projects of Cochrane for the improvement of his palaces, he is stated to have tampered extensively with the coinage; but there is really no substantial evidence that his artistic tastes were so expensive as to involve the nation in pecuniary distress. Probably, also, his artistic expensiveness would have mattered little had he been personally popular and manifested any true capacity for government. His fatality was that he could make himself neither loved nor feared. Moreover, while his two predecessors endeavoured to teach the nobles their duty to the king and to the State, he simply ignored the nobles, giving them also gratuitous offence by selecting his advisers not from them, but from favourite ecclesiastics, and those who had, or pretended to have, similar tastes to his own, or as Pitscottie—representing the common, if erroneous, opinion — phrases it, “pythankis [sycophants] and cowardis.” None of the nobles were employed in the negotiations with England; the embassy of sixteen was composed wholly of certain favourite ecclesiastics, while the members of the special commission appointed later to complete them were the king’s favourite, John Ramsay, created Earl of Bothwell, and Bishop Elphinstone of Aberdeen. Negotiations with England, in which the nobles had no share, were certain to offend and alarm them. To state that he meditated “the inbringing of Englishmen to the perpetual subjugation of the kingdom,” was probably party exaggeration; but they might well, in the circumstances, regard the negotiations as menacing their interests.

The actual occasion of the rising against him was a quarrel with the Homes. To maintain his galaxy of musicians which, besides employing them in his

chapel, he was accustomed to have continually with him for his solace, he obtained the sanction of the Pope for the annexation of the revenues of Coldingham Priory to his Chapel Royal at Stirling. The Homes, deeming this an unwarranted interference with their perquisites, entered into a league with the Hepburns to resist the appropriation, and when James induced the Parliament to support it, the Homes found additional allies in Angus and the old Lauder Bridge conspirators. Soon the conspiracy embraced all the Southern nobles, as well as the Earl of Argyll and the Bishops of Glasgow and Dunkeld. That the nobles succeeded in also obtaining the support of the young Prince James, seems to indicate that the king was lacking in the qualities that secure filial affection. So formidable was the combination against him that at first he had no choice but flight. Crossing the Frith of Forth in a ship of his friend Sir Andrew Wood, he, however, found himself in a friendly territory; and after rousing Fife on his behalf, he passed on to the North. Then, gathering accessions from all sides as he marched southwards, he concentrated at Stirling some thirty thousand men. Thence he advanced to Blackness. To strike swiftly and unfalteringly was his one and only duty and his one and only chance of triumph: to condescend to treat as he did, after some faint skirmishing, was to confer on his opponents a diplomatic standing to which as rebels they were not entitled; but besides doing so, he agreed to conditions which both seemed to justify the nobles in their action and placed him in a position of subordination to them. True, his "person" was to be "at all times in honourable security and freedom"; but there were to be "prelates, lords, and others of wisdom and good disposition daily about him for the guiding of his realm," — which meant

virtually his suspension from exercising the independent functions of sovereignty.

But, lacking in the wisdom to seek to commend himself to the nobles and the nation, and in the courage openly to defy his opponents, he had yet not the faintest intention of succumbing to their dictation. What he hoped to effect was their dispersion, his purpose being to interpret the articles in a fashion to suit himself; but since, as the lords put it, the "articles were diverse times granted and broken by the diverse counsel of diverse persons," they, if they had partly dispersed, resolved to reassemble; and they were now in arms at a great advantage, for they were parties to a bargain which they had a right to see fulfilled. Huntly, Marischal, and Glamis now left the king, who went north to Stirling, whither his supporters were summoned again to rendezvous. On 11th June 1488 the two armies fronted each other at Sauchieburn, about a mile south of the old battlefield of Bannockburn. That James was at least faintly stirred by its great memories, he showed by equipping himself with the sword of Robert the Bruce; but, alas! it brought him neither luck nor courage. The stout Lord Lindsay also presented him with his great grey courser. Should the fates grant him victory, the horse, Lord Lindsay told him—so at least records Pitscottie—would be invaluable in following up the foe, and should the battle go against him, it would out-distance all pursuit. It was not in the sword, but in the horse, that the king when the crisis came put his trust: he used the horse not for battle but for flight, and during flight he contrived to drop his sword, which, later, was discovered not far from the battlefield.

But during the preliminaries he was apparently able to demean himself as a king. Like Bruce before Bannockburn, he accompanied his generals in arrang-

ing the formation of the battle; and though the occasion was deplorable rather than inspiring, there were doubtless ripples of enthusiasm as he passed along the lines. The statements of Buchanan, Ferrerius, and Leslie as to the battle arrangements are quite untrustworthy: apparently they have confused this muster with the earlier one, for the records of the Parliament are undeniable proof that Huntly, Marischal, and Glamis had seceded from the king. There is no reliable information on the circumstances of his flight; but that he fled before his followers were definitely defeated is the theory most consistent with the isolated character of the flight which resulted in his assassination.

No minute inquiry was made at the time into the circumstances of his death. According to the official account "he happened to be slain," where, how, or by whom, is not mentioned. In 1491 a reward of land fee and heritage was offered for the discovery of his murderer, but none were so foolhardy as to come forward as accusers. While doubtless a little highly coloured in details, the Pitscottie version of the murder is probable enough. It is more likely that James fell from his horse than that, as Ferrerius vaguely states, his horse failed him. Pitscottie had also a better knowledge of tradition than had the other historians. He records that the wife of the miller of Milton was returning from the well, when, alarmed by the sudden appearance of a galloping horseman in full armour, she dropped her can and fled into the house. The horse, shying at the water-can, leapt over the burn and caused the "ill-sittin king" to lose his seat and fall heavily, crushed and rendered insensible by the weight of his armour. While in a swoon he was carried into the mill; and on recovering consciousness made known his identity, and required, with apparently unnecessary

though characteristic enough apprehension, that a priest should be sent to give him absolution. The pursuers were now in full chase, and when the woman "ran forth and cried for a priest," some one answered, "Here am I, a priest, where is the king?" Being asked by the king to give him the sacrament, he answered, "that sal I do hastily," and struck him "with a dagger four or five times in the heart, and syne gat him on his hack and hied him away." The assassin, Pitscottie states, was a servant of Lord Gray; while Buchanan divides responsibility for his death between Patrick Gray, Stirling of Keir, and Borthwick a priest. His body, found either in the mill or in the neighbourhood, was buried beside his wife before the high altar of Cambuskenneth Abbey, where, in 1865, a monument was erected to their memory by Queen Victoria.

He left three sons: James, Duke of Rothesay, who became James IV.; another son James, Duke of Ross, who became Archbishop of St Andrews, and later, Lord High Chancellor, and is eulogised in Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*; and John, Earl of Mar. Certain statements of Buchanan and Leslie as to the licentious tendencies of James III. are clearly of a more or less fabulous character.

However much the artistic tastes of James III. may do him credit, the general character of his reign and the final calamity that overtook him, sufficiently attest his lack of the qualities required in those difficult and stern times for successful sovereignty. He was unable to profit by the strong position in which the sovereignty had been placed by his predecessors, and he considerably lowered its influence. He did much to encourage the political ambitions of the ecclesiastics, and to widen the breach between them and the nobles; but the evil consequences of this were modified or partly suspended during the reign of his remarkable son.

Born 17th March 1472, James IV., when he succeeded his father, was over sixteen years of age. Buchanan's statement to the contrary, he must have been carefully educated. Ayala, the Spanish ambassador, states that, in addition to Latin, he spoke the principal European languages, and also "the language of the savages who live in some parts of Scotland and in the islands." Erasmus eulogises him in his *Adagia* as having "a wonderful force of intellect, an astonishing knowledge of everything, an invincible magnanimity, the dignity of a true king, the greatest courtesy and the most abounding liberality." Judging from the books added to the royal library during his lifetime, his reading embraced both classical and theological works. His enlightened interest in education and learning was shown by placing his son by Marion Boyd, Alexander, afterwards Archbishop of St Andrews, under the tutorship of Erasmus; by the law regarding the education of sons of barons and freeholders; by the interest he showed in the foundation of Aberdeen University in 1495; by his patronage of the great Scottish poets—Blind Harry, Henryson, Dunbar, Douglas, Kennedy, &c.—of this golden period of Scottish literature; and by his conferment, in 1507, of a monopoly of the new invention of printing on Walter Chepman, a clerk in the office of his secretary, and Andrew Myllar, who had acquired a knowledge of the art in France. Inheriting his father's musical and artistic tendencies, he was an accomplished performer on the musical instruments of the time, and, as we learn from Dunbar, a special patron of carvers, glasswrights, goldsmiths, lapidaries, and painters. But his special bent was towards science. His reputed skill as a surgeon is confirmed by the Lord High Treasurer's Accounts, which show that, in emergencies, he was ready to give any of his subjects the benefit of his skill. On the College of Surgeons,

founded in 1505, he in the following year conferred the title of "Royal." Aided by John Damian, a Lombardian physician, he made a strenuous but vain search for the *quinta essentia*, by a series of experiments at Stirling and Edinburgh. Damian, under his auspices, also attempted, by the aid of artificial wings, to anticipate the modern aeroplane, with, however, only the ludicrous consequences satirised in a graphic skit by Dunbar.

Unlike his father, James IV. was far from a recluse. He kept a brilliant court, and was an eager follower of the chase, and a high proficient in knightly accomplishments. "When not at war," records Ayala, "he hunts in the mountains." He was also famed for his jousts and tourneys, which attracted knights from all parts of Europe; and, as an unknown "wild knight," he appeared on one occasion as the champion of the "black lady," probably the queen's Black Ellen, celebrated in Dunbar's *Of ain Blak-Moir*. His court was thronged with varied types of character and professions, and his State occupations and scientific pursuits were interspersed with abundant pastimes. Ayala describes him as of "noble stature, neither tall nor short, and as handsome in shape and complexion as man can be." We have also this snapshot of him by John Young, Somerset Herald, taken as he was leaving Dalkeith after an interview with his bride, Margaret of England. "The king took leave of her and went to his horse, on whom he did leap without putting his foot in the stirrup. And the said horse was a right fair courser; and incontinent the king spurred, follow who might." Here we have evidently a quite other man and king from the "ill-sittin rider" who fell off his horse "before the mill-door at Bannockburn." In almost every respect he strikingly contrasted with his father, and he was probably the most popular of all the Stewart sovereigns.

Whatever the motives which induced James to join the insurgents against his father, his tragic death filled him with a deep remorse of which he was never able altogether to rid himself, though it is possible that his habit of wearing around him an iron belt, and of periodically withdrawing to religious houses for penance, was also meant to impress his subjects with a sense of the deep guilt of rebellion against a sovereign. However that may be, he became a very scrupulous observer of "the precepts of the Church." Ayala also records that he "has a great predilection for priests, and receives advice from them, especially from the Friars Observant, to whom he confesses." Begun during the great vogue of the excellent Bishop Kennedy and continued by James III., we can trace in the reign of James IV. the increasing dominance of the ecclesiastics, who seem to have utilised his partly superstitious compunctions for their own ends.

Ayala mentions that certain of the nobles had countenanced the intrigues of the youthful king with their relatives "in order to keep him in their subjection." The statement receives some support from the list of his recognised mistresses; and that he had also amours of a more temporary kind, we gather from Dunbar's trenchant lines, *The Wooing of the King quhen he was in Dunfermline*; but certain strong statements of Tytler about a deliberate attempt of the nobles to "degrade and destroy" his character by "dissolving it in pleasure," are due to the confounding of a "Lady Margaret," the king's aunt, mentioned in the Lord High Treasurer's Accounts, with Lady Margaret Drummond, who, at a later period, was a favourite mistress of the king.

After his coronation, some time before the 26th June, James attended the funeral of his father at Cambuskenneth Abbey. While the leaders of the revolt con-

ferred on themselves the chief offices of State, they adopted towards their opponents a precautionary rather than a vindictive policy. Certain sporadic efforts to raise the country against them were easily quelled. Lords Lennox and Lyle took up arms in the West of Scotland, and Lord Forbes, by exposing on his spear at Aberdeen what he declared to be the blood-stained shirt of the late king, collected a considerable force, with which he marched south to their help. Lyle's castle of Duchal and Lennox's castle of Crookston, had, however, already been captured; and after a strong force under Lennox, on its way to join the northern insurgents, had been routed at Talla Moss, the rising collapsed.

Some trouble now arose with England. The feat of Sir Andrew Wood in capturing three powerful ships of Stephen Bull in 1489, was, though more than justifiable, necessarily the reverse of palatable to Henry VII., who also could not but be displeased with a revolution which so suddenly put an end to the marriage negotiations with England. But his disappointment far from justified the curious agreement into which, on 16th and 17th April 1491, he entered with Sir John Ramsay and Sir Thomas Tod, who, for some £260, to be returned should the enterprise fail, undertook that the Earl of Buchan and Sir Thomas Tod should deliver into his hands the King of Scots and the Duke of Ross, or if not both, then the King of Scots. Nothing came of the project, but about the same time Henry VII. induced Angus to enter into an alliance, binding himself and his son George to do their utmost to prevent the King of Scots making war with England, and in certain circumstances to deliver up Liddesdale and the castle of the Hermitage to Henry in exchange for an equivalent in England. Owing to the mutilation of the document, the terms of the agreement cannot be definitely ascer-

tained, and even the date is doubtful. The date is of some consequence, for Lyon Herald on 2nd July 1491 was sent to Perth to charge Angus to Tantallon, though as late as 21st December there is an entry in the Treasurer's Accounts of cloth, lining, and trimming for a long gown to him; and he played dice with the king—whose guardian he was—not long before, and not long after this. But, again, some kind of suspicion must have fallen on him, for on 29th December he was made to exchange Liddesdale and the Hermitage for the Lordship of Kilmarnock. Further, on 6th March 1491-2, Liddesdale and the Hermitage were bestowed on Patrick Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell, who resigned the Lordship of Bothwell, that the king might bestow it on Angus in lieu of Kilmarnock, which since 1424 had been inalienably annexed to the crown. On the death of Argyll in 1493, Angus succeeded him as Lord High Chancellor, and though he resigned this office in 1498, there is no evidence of further treasonable negotiations between him and England. On 21st December 1491 a truce with England was concluded for five years.

Unlike his father, James IV., according to Leslie, was always careful to have some of his council about him for consultation in matters of moment; and while subduing faction by the peculiar charm of his personality, he was scrupulous in attending the justice-ayres, and careful to see that justice was administered without fear or favour. To him also belongs a further development of the supreme courts of law. The itinerant courts of justice were superseded in March 1503-4 by a Daily Council, chosen by the king himself, to "sit continually at Edinburgh or where the king made residence." The king was thus enabled to exercise a more direct control over the execution of justice, though from Dunbar's pungent satire, *Tidings*

fræe the Session, we may infer that corruption was far from impossible in the new court.

The outstanding domestic achievement of James IV. was the completion of the country's internal unification by the subjugation of the Isles and the extinction of that ancient lordship, which to the later Scottish kings had been a source of continuous trouble and menace. On account of the annexation of the Earldom of Ross to the crown at the time of the submission of John, Lord of the Isles, his bastard son Angus—recognised both by Celtic usage and by Parliament as his heir—not only made an attempt to wrest the Earldom of Ross from the government, but defeated his father at the battle of "Bloody Bay," and received recognition from the Islesmen as their lord. In 1485 Angus was assassinated by an Irish harper, but the Islesmen set up as their chief, Alexander, nephew of the old lord, who after, in 1491, capturing Inverness, advanced into Ross where he was defeated by the Mackenzies. In May 1493 the possessions and titles of the Lords of the Isles were declared forfeited; but the old lord was granted a royal pension, and finally retired to Paisley Abbey, where he died in 1498.

In May 1495 the king, clad in gaudy robes, made a royal progress to the Isles, and received at Ardnamurchan the submission of many island chiefs; but Alexander, in 1497, made another attack on Ross and was again defeated; and a little later he was slain by MacIan of Ardnamurchan. His revolt caused James to revoke the charter he had given to the chiefs, and in 1498 a commission of lord-lieutenancy over the Isles was given to Argyll. On the death of Alexander, Donald Dubh—son of Angus assassinated in 1485—became the recognised head of the clan. He had been confined in Inchconnel Castle in Lochawe, but having, in 1501, effected his escape, he, in 1503, made a

destructive raid into Lochaber. Various efforts were made by Argyll and Huntly to subdue him, and after the defeat of the Islesmen in 1505, by a fleet under Wood and Robert Barton, he was captured in the fortress of Carniburg, near Mull, and sent to Edinburgh Castle. Forty years afterwards he made his escape and gave some trouble. Still from 1506, when the northern portion of the lordship was placed under Huntly and the southern under Argyll, there was an end of that "old song"; and with the death of Donald Dubh in 1545 perished the last hope of the revival of the glories of the old lordship.

Notwithstanding the vigorous rule of James IV. it did not greatly check a certain social corruption in Scotland, which was the fruit of many causes operating through several centuries. The old political and ecclesiastical institutions were becoming largely effete: the ceremonies of the middle ages were being cast off, but the new age had hardly yet begun to breathe. Still, under his strong yet genial authority, there was a considerable advance in the maintenance of external order, and in national prosperity and the arts of civilised life. "Since the present king," wrote Ayala, "succeeded to the throne, they [the Scots] do not dare to quarrel so much with one another, as formerly, especially since he came of age. They have learned that he executes the law without respect to rich or poor. I am told that Scotland has improved so much during his reign that it is worth three times more than formerly."

A notable circumstance in the early reign of James IV. was his patronage of Perkin Warbeck, the impersonator of the murdered Richard, Duke of York. The recent publication of various State documents manifests the immense influence of the Warbeck imposture on the diplomacy of the period. His claims were rendered formidable by being vouched for by the Duchess of

Burgundy, Richard's aunt and sister of Edward IV.; and it is small wonder if James, influenced by his wishes, persuaded himself of their genuineness. True, both Charles VIII. of France and Ferdinand of Spain asserted that they had proof positive of the imposture; but their averments were necessarily coloured by their political aims. Indeed we find Ferdinand expressing doubts of the value of the evidence with which the King of France proposed to provide Henry VII., and offering, if Henry wished for something of the kind, to "do it better than the King of France." He also virtually told Henry that the attitude of the Pope towards Warbeck would depend on Henry's attitude towards the League; if Henry will enter the League, he promises to induce the Pope to use his authority "against him of York," whereas if Henry will not do so, the Pope, he affirms, will support his claims.

In having Warbeck—to whom he gave in marriage his cousin, Catherine Gordon, daughter of the Earl of Huntly—in Scotland, James evidently deemed that he possessed a kind of political trump card. In patronising him, his primary aim was to secure Berwick-on-Tweed; but he was also set on a marriage with a Spanish princess, and on this condition Ferdinand and Isabella were given to understand that he was prepared to promise "perpetual peace with England and perfect safety to Henry from him of York." But far from embarrassed by the Scottish king's possession of Warbeck, they utilised it to persuade Henry to enter the Holy League and to come to terms with James that he also might join the League. On 2nd September 1496 Henry therefore issued a commission to the Bishop of Durham to treat of a marriage of the King of Scots to one of his daughters; but this merely strengthened the resolution of James to assist Warbeck in an invasion of England. According to Sir John

Ramsay, who was now performing the ignoble part of English spy, the Scottish army did not number more than 1400, and the ordnance was of very little account. This might be true, for the aim of James was to attract English followers to Warbeck's standard. But when, on 1st September, Warbeck, displaying the banner and standard of the Duke of York, entered English territory, his proclamation met with no response. James then began to ravage the country. The English chronicler Hall implies that he sought to terrorise the inhabitants into joining Warbeck; but he seems to have been actuated rather by resentment: as Leslie puts it, "when he saw nocht so meikle as ane of the vulgar peple to support Richard, to Scotland he returned with a fatt prey." By the failure of the attempt to instigate a rising on Warbeck's behalf, his political value to James had suddenly sunk almost to zero; he was no longer clothed in the glamour of the great political possibilities by which James had been bewitched. But though there was no reason for detaining him longer in Scotland, James did not become less considerate of him; when in July 1497 he and his wife set sail from Ayr, it was in a luxuriously provisioned ship commanded by Robert Barton. James was, in fact, desirous to give him another chance. He headed a great expedition into England and laid siege to Norham Castle; and meanwhile Warbeck, after touching at Ireland, landed in September in Cornwall. On the advance, however, of Surrey towards Scotland, James, on the advice of the Spanish Ambassador, Ayala, signed, on 28th September, a seven years' truce with England. Meanwhile Warbeck, after laying siege to Exeter with 6000 Cornish men, cravenly retreated before the Earl of Devon, and deserting his followers during the night, took refuge in the sanctuary of Beaulieu. Here he surrendered on promise of pardon, and after confessing

his imposture, he was kept in honourable confinement until his attempts at escape caused his execution at Tyburn, 21st November 1499.

On 18th February 1497-8 the truce with England was prolonged until a year after the death of the last of the contracting parties; and negotiations were begun for a marriage between James and the Princess Margaret. First suggested by the Spanish sovereigns, the marriage was really brought about by them. It was part of a scheme for an alliance of the three kings to curb the influence of France. Henry, so Ayala affirmed, would have rather preferred, on account of the youth of the Princess Margaret, that James should have married a Spanish princess; but for them other arrangements had been made. Ayala was afraid that the denial to him of a Spanish princess would be badly received by James, and how he reconciled him to his disappointment we know not, but James could no longer boast of the diplomatic advantage he once believed to be his; and, moreover, the proposed Holy League appealed both to his vanity and his ecclesiastical idealism; for its purpose, so far as it was revealed to him, was to bring about a millennium of peace among Christian nations and a combination of their forces against the infidel. There was some haggling over the dowry, but it was finally fixed at 30,000 English nobles; and on 18th October 1501 commissioners were sent to England to contract a marriage and to treat of a perpetual peace. Warmly welcomed by Henry, they were entertained with jousts and "with banquets and most goodly disguisings"; and when in Christmas week they, with various noble English lords, dined with the Lord Mayor, William Dunbar, the Scottish laureate, delighted the company by the recital of his fine poem in praise of London. The contract having been signed at Richmond on

24th January 1501-2, the betrothal was on the following day declared at St Paul's Cross, the occasion being celebrated by a solemn Te Deum in the Cathedral, and in the evening by several great bonfires in the streets, with hogsheads of wine for the delectation of the multitude.

On 18th September 1502 the King of Scots, standing near the right hand of the high altar of Glasgow Cathedral, swore to observe the treaties of peace and marriage, concluded on the previous 24th of January by his ambassadors; but later, observing that in the treaty Henry was given the title "King of France," he, the same evening, executed a notarial instrument, declaring that he had not seen the word "France," and signed a new copy in which the title was cancelled. It was not until 23rd June 1503 that Margaret, then only in her fourteenth year, set out for Scotland, arriving at Dalkeith Palace on 3rd August. There she rested several days, the king paying her daily ceremonial visits. Particulars of the formalities observed—the reverences, the salutations, the supping and drinking, the solemn exhibition of accomplishments in dancing, singing, and playing—have been carefully noted down by Young, the Somerset Herald. On the 7th she made her state entry into Edinburgh, the king, as they neared the city, dismounting from his own splendidly-harnessed courser and mounting on the palfrey of the Queen, who rode through the city behind him.

The marriage—celebrated in Holyrood on the day after the enthusiastic scenes of welcome—was fondly deemed the beginning of a new epoch of unbroken friendliness between the "auld enemies" of many centuries. The windows of Holyrood were adorned with the device of the English rose in unison with the Scottish thistle; and William Dunbar voiced the

national sentiments in his aureate poem, *The Thrissel and The Rois*, and in an exquisite lyric, sung at the marriage banquet, *Now Fayre, Fayrest off Every Fayer*. But the forecasts of endless harmony between the two nations were soon belied. In the end the marriage was to result in the union of the crowns and later of the kingdoms; but before the former union a stupendous ecclesiastical revolution was to occur and another century was to elapse; and Flodden and Solway Moss and other bloody fields and wild wastes of internal anarchy and cruel distress were to intervene before a paradise of complete concord was to open its golden gates to the two long-estranged nations.

So long as Henry VII. lived nothing happened to cause a recurrence of the estrangement, but shortly after the accession of Henry VIII. the fair prospects of tranquillity began to darken. The dangerous character of certain abstractly excellent articles of the treaty then became manifest. James had boggled at the title "King of France" applied to Henry VII.; but the following clause had more fatal effectiveness against the old French friendship: "Either king may give aid to his ally, but *not by any invasion of the other's territory*"; and another made much irritating conduct possible between the two peoples without the actual declaration of war.

Meantime, an offensive and defensive league with Denmark had been confirmed by James at Stirling in May 1499; in 1502 he sent two ships, with 2000 men, to assist his uncle against the Swedes; and in 1508 a new and powerful man-of-war under Sir Andrew Barton assisted the Danes in the siege of Lübeck. To oblige Henry VII. he effectively remonstrated with his kinsman, Duke Charles of Gueldres, for giving his countenance to an English malcontent, Edmund de la Pole; but when, in 1506, he was led to believe that Henry

intended to join Philip of Castile and Maximilian, King of the Romans, against the Duke, he protested that should Henry take up arms against the Duke he would be compelled to regard his "illustrious father-in-law as an enemy."

In 1507 Pope Julius presented James with the gold and purple cap of maintenance and a golden-hilted sword in a richly jewelled scabbard, with the title, "Protector and Defender of the Christian Faith"; because while other princes were engaged in war, he alone stood aloof. Yet his peaceful proclivities were to bring him into almost direct conflict with Papal authority; and by a curious irony they were also to involve Scotland in perhaps the most mortifying of her many military disasters. Shortly before the death of Henry VII., 21st April 1509, occurred the murder of Sir Robert Ker of Caverston, Warden of the Middle Marches, by three Englishmen, Lilburne, Starhead, and Heron. Though Lilburne was delivered up to the Scots, Starhead and Heron remained at large, and after Henry VIII.'s accession were protected by him. As a clause in the treaty provided in such a case for reprisals, Sir Robert Ker's son, Sir Andrew, sent, in 1511, to Starhead's house two vassals, who killed Starhead and brought him his head; but Henry VIII. continued to protect Heron, the chief assassin. Then in two other matters he deeply wounded his brother-in-law's *amour-propre*. The first was the retention of the legacy of jewels which the Scottish queen's brother, Arthur Prince of Wales, had bequeathed to his father, on the understanding that they would pass to his sister after his father's death; and the second was the attack on Sir Andrew Barton, which resulted in his death and the capture of his ships. James asked compensation for his death and the detention of the government ship, the *Lion*, but Henry, on the ground that Barton was a

mere pirate, declined to discuss the question. In all three cases the attitude of Henry VIII. was, to say the least, the reverse of conciliatory, and was bound to create deep distrust as to his ultimate intentions towards Scotland in his alliance with Spain against France. But deeply as James has been blamed for his subsequent invasion of England, he did his utmost to avoid what he came to deem an imperative necessity. He was long-suffering enough with his overbearing brother-in-law. While preparing for eventualities by the increase of his navy, by correspondence with Denmark, by wappinschawings, and by the collection of artillery and war material, he was indefatigable in his efforts to arrest the threatened combination against France. On 19th March 1512 he reminded Ferdinand of Spain that it was at his request he was induced to make affinity with Henry VII., and in the interests of peace he begged him to use his influence for the reconciliation of Louis XII. and the Pope; and, later, he wrote in similar terms to the Pope and Henry VIII. "What," he exclaims, writing to Julius II., "can be worse than that a Holy Father and a Christian son should level their swords at each other's throats?"

Henry VIII., who, in 1510, had renewed the treaty with France, had had no provocation from her. But at this stage of his political and ecclesiastical career he was dominated largely by Wolsey. He was possessed by even a certain mystical devotion to the Church, though conjoined with the earthly allurements of military renown and the romantic hope of the ultimate recovery of England's possessions in France. The purpose of the Pope, again, was to annex Ferrara to the Papal states and drive France out of Italy; and Ferdinand, while naturally in sympathy with any design tending to curb the power of France, more particularly desired to extend and strengthen his fron-

tiers by absorbing the kingdom of Navarre. Finding remonstrances with Henry, Ferdinand, and the Pope alike vain, James, on 22nd May 1512, sanctioned a league with France "for mutual help against the attempt of England," which was confirmed by him on 2nd July. But notwithstanding the expeditions against France in 1512 he throughout that year did no more than send Robert Barton to prey on English merchantmen. Before the campaign of 1513 the situation had undergone modifications: the alliance of France with Venice begat an alliance between the Pope and the Emperor; in February 1512-13 Pope Julius died, his successor being Leo X.; and various intrigues of Ferdinand of Spain brought about, on 1st April, a truce between that country and France. James now urged Henry VIII. to join the truce, but it had been devised by Ferdinand merely to check the possible ambitions of Henry VIII.; and it was rendered futile by the Treaty of Malines, 5th April, between Henry and the Emperor, and that of 18th April, binding Ferdinand to declare war with France within thirty days.

Meantime James had been preparing for possibilities, by the importation of guns, powder, and provisions from France and Denmark; and his naval preparations were now proceeding at express speed. In April Dr West, Henry's ambassador, saw numerous workmen busy completing the *Margaret*, but he says nothing of the *Great Michell*, which may fairly be entitled the Dreadnought of the century, and in size and strength far surpassed the *Great Harry* of Henry VIII. The statements of Pitscottie as to her size and strength are fully corroborated by the Lord Treasurer's Accounts, the number of her marines being no fewer than three hundred, as compared with the eighty and sixty respectively of the *James* and *Margaret*. The king must

have hoped for great accounts of her doings with the fleet which he sent to the help of France; but owing to the incompetence of Arran, the Admiral, even the Scottish soldiers carried by the fleet were not landed in time for their special purpose. After Flodden she was sold to the French government.

In April James stated to Dr West that he had no desire to break the peace, if he had satisfactory assurance and proper justice from England. To hold James in suspense Henry agreed that commissioners should meet at the Borders in June to consider the question of redress; but when they met, his commissioners intimated that they were instructed to propose an adjournment until 15th October. The non-conciliatory attitude of Henry necessarily confirmed James in the conviction he expressed to the King of Denmark that the crippling of France would endanger the safety of Scotland; and it decided him not merely to assist France but to renounce the old treaty of peace by declaring war directly against England. On 26th July, Lyon King was therefore sent to Henry's camp in France with the message that he had resolved to "do what things we trust may cause you to desert your pursuit of the King of France." The same day the navy put to sea, James sailing in the *Michell* until she passed the May.

Forman, Bishop of Moray, the Scottish ambassador in France, has been burdened with the chief responsibility for the extreme steps now taken by James; but so far from Forman enticing James to support France, Spinelly wrote thus of him to Henry VIII.: "He does not like the French, and had his charge thither from the late King of Scots against his will." Even also, if Anne of Brittany, the wife of Louis, did, as the picturesque Pitscottie affirms, send James a ring, craving him to act as her true knight, it is absurd

to suppose that this was the main cause of his decision to invade England. Nor is there any proof that James was supported in his decision only by the more headstrong, though a war practically against the Pope was bound to be deprecated by the stricter ecclesiastics. Many, also, wise after the event, became persuaded that their forebodings were stronger than their hopes. Pitscottie tells us that James "rejected all godly counsell," &c. ; and Boece affirms that when Bishop Elphinstone and others proposed that before invading England, James should send to dissuade Henry from a war against France, the proposal caused so great a clamour in the council that order was with difficulty maintained ; but, as we have seen, this was the course all along pursued by James. There can hardly, however, be a doubt that the clergy endeavoured to appeal to the superstitions of the king, by contriving the appearance at evensong in the chapel of Linlithgow Palace of an apparition in a blue gown, representing John the Baptist, which got sufficiently near the king to utter a solemn warning that should he go to war with England "he would be confounded and put to shame" ; and it is not improbable that thereafter an awesome voice, though not from the other world, was heard at midnight in the Edinburgh streets, summoning by name certain nobles and leaders of the Scottish army to appear before the presence of his master the evil one within forty days.

As soon as he had despatched his letter to Henry VIII., James sent out a summons for a general muster at Ellem in the Lammermoors, the place being later changed to the Boroughmuir, Edinburgh. The size of the muster sufficiently refutes the statements as to the unpopularity of the expedition. Various authorities estimated it at 100,000, and it may have reached 80,000. Though a rather heterogeneous array,

it possessed a splendid artillery. The Lord Treasurer's Accounts testify that in perfecting it James had spared neither expense nor skill; and Ruthal, after Flodden, described it to Henry VIII. as "the finest that has been seen." It also rendered him remarkably effective service in the rapid storming of the Border strongholds of Norham, Wark, Ettal, and Ford. Of the effect produced in the north of England by the fall of Norham, we have striking testimony in the remark of Ruthal: "The news," he wrote, "touched me so near with reverend sorrow, that I had liever been out of the world than in it." It may be that James was more polite than prudent in his courtesy to Lady Heron at Ford, and he may have been remiss in giving her opportunity to act as spy to the English general, Surrey; but Pitscottie's tale that he remained at Ford "the space of twenty days without battel or the appearance of the same" is mere romance. What are the facts? He entered England on 22nd August; within fifteen days of his arrival there he had to face Surrey; and before that time he had by his splendid ordnance successfully assaulted all the castles he desired in order to have a free battlefield.

Ruthal affirms that after the king attacked Norham, "20,000 of his men left him, foreboding mischief"; but the Scottish authorities affirm that those who left him left for provisions. Little trust can be put in an English statement that large stores of provisions were found in the Scottish camp. The pavilions of the nobles may have been well provided with wine, ale, &c.; but the story that the English destroyed what provisions they found, is, whether true or not, almost proof positive that few provisions were found. Leslie, of course, exaggerates in asserting that "only the principal noblemen of the realm nor few companies remained with him"; but great depletion seems indicated in the peculiarity of

the Scottish loss, which gives Flodden its mournful pre-eminence over all Scottish defeats—the extraordinary proportion of “the best gentlemen and flower of Scotland” that were slain. There is no evidence for Hill Burton’s statement that these men were drawn from their posts and their followers to support the king, and were thus “gathered into a cluster for slaughter”; nor will the more definite story that “thirteen earls were found in a ring round his body” bear examination, for not so many earls were slain, and several of these were slain on the wings.

It may have been the temporary depletion of his army that caused James to take up his strong position on Flodden ridge, where, in answer to a message of Surrey, he agreed to await battle with him, as he requested, for three days. If his force was so immensely superior, as was stated, to that of Surrey, there was no reason why he should not give Surrey battle; if it was much depleted, his better plan would have been to have retired; but he probably judged that his strong position would give him an advantage. Had he remained on the heights he probably could have baffled Surrey; but (1) from lack of stores he could not remain there long; (2) he might not know how famished were the forces of Surrey; and (3) Surrey had placed himself between him and Scotland. “The King of Scots,” says a contemporary writer, “perceiving the Englishmen marching towards Scotland, thought that they would have entered into Scotland to burn and foray the plentiful country called the March, for so was he made believe by an Englishman, Giles Musgrave, who was familiar with the King of Scots, and did it for a policy to cause him to come down from the hill.” Depleted though his army was, he was led to suppose that he had no other option than to attack Surrey. With his usual impetuosity, he also allowed himself

to be so drawn into personal conflict with the foe as to be unable to guide the fortunes of the fight; but it is difficult to say how far this affected the ultimate result. After burning the baggage to drive the smoke in the face of the enemy, he trusted mainly to the impetus of a rapid and comprehensive attack, the character of which would be for some time hidden from the enemy. The failure of his splendid artillery to do any effective execution may have been partly due to the smoke, or the lack of precise instruction from him: Leslie states that owing to the height on which it stood it shot over the English army. While the depleted state of the Scottish army lessens the marvel of the English victory, the English army was, probably, apart from Surrey's generalship, the better fighting force of the two. It possessed greater homogeneity. The impetuous Highlanders and the hardy Borderers were unsurpassable in individual prowess; but, so far as can be judged, they seem to have been largely responsible for the Scottish catastrophe. The battle was practically decided (1) by the rout of the Highlanders on the extreme Scottish right after the failure of a headlong charge, and (2) by the conduct of the Borderers under Lord Home, who, after aiding Huntly to route the English vanguard, dispersed to plunder. Huntly was thus unable to check a second attack of the rallied English, reinforced by Dacre's horse, and Huntly's division being vanquished, it was almost inevitable that the next division should succumb. An overwhelming English force thus gradually encompassed the centre led by the king, and the division next to it led by Bothwell. Attacked on flank and then on rear, as well as on front, the desperate prowess of the king and his devoted knights could not prevent overwhelming disaster. The Scots, relates Ruthal, were such large and strong men, "they would not fall when four or

five bills struck one of them at once. . . . Howbeit our bills quitted them very well, and did more good that day than bows, for they shortly disappointed the Scots of their long spears wherein was their greatest trust." Thus ended so direly for the Scots the Flodden field of 9th September 1513.

What became of the king's body is a mystery. From the testimony of those who had known him, the English accepted as his, a body pierced with many wounds, found within a spear-length of Surrey, and after its embalment brought it south to Richmond. Though James died when under excommunication, the Pope, at the suggestion of Henry VIII., authorised its burial in St Paul's; but since this was not done, it may plausibly be conjectured that, in the end, the English became doubtful of its identity. Stow, in his notice of St Michael's in Wood Street, has this curious record: "There is also (but without any outward monument) the head of James the Fourth, King of Scots of that name, slain at Flodden field and buried here by this occasion; after the battle the body of the said king being found, was enclosed in lead, and conveyed from thence to London, and so to the monastery of Skene in Surrey, where it remained for a time, in what order I am not certain; but since the dissolution of that house, in the reign of Edward VI., Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk, being lodged and keeping house there, I have been shown the same body so lapped in lead, close to the head and body, thrown into a waste room amongst the old timber, lead and other ruble. Since the which time workmen there, for their foolish pleasure, hewed off his head; and Launcelot Young, master glazier to Her Majesty, feeling a sweet savour to come from thence, and seeing the same dried from all moisture, and yet the form remaining, with the hair of the head and beard red, brought it to London to

his house in Wood Street, where for a time he kept it for its sweetness, but in the end caused the sexton of that church to bury it among other bones taken out of their charnel." The Scots, however, declined to admit the capture of the king's body. Leslie affirms that the body the English got was that of the laird of Bonhard, and that "the king himself was seen alive at Kelso." A general tradition was that after making his long contemplated pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he passed the rest of his days in penance; but Pitscottie, who points out that the English have nothing to say of the king's iron belt, records a legend of the body's burial in the merse between Dunse and Kelso. An amazing circumstance is that Margaret got divorce from Angus on the ground that when she married him, James IV. was still alive. Ruthal mentions that his banner, sword, and the harness of his thighs were placed in Durham Cathedral; and his reputed dagger is preserved in the Herald's College, London.

Supremely mournful as was the death of James IV., he was prevented from tasting the full bitterness of his calamity. At the moment of its passing, his spirit was enraptured with the battle fervour which consumes all other emotions. Gloomy, also, and bitter, beyond our imagination to conceive, as were the Scottish memories long associated with Flodden, the last dauntless stand of the king and those around him was yet a source of high gratification and national pride; and he lived in popular tradition less as a discredited general than as a heroic and stainless knight of chivalry. He was also specially mourned on account of his great popularity as a ruler. Though not sufficiently master of his impulses, he was yet largely governed by noble aspirations and ideals; and he may not unfitly be described as one of the ablest and best of Scottish kings. The part he played as sovereign, if sometimes

rash, was always energetic, manful, and sincere, and though his reign closed in calamity, its general influence had been largely beneficent, and had the times been less "out of joint," it might have been exceptionally so.

By Margaret Tudor, the only surviving child of James IV. was James, who succeeded him. A posthumous son, Alexander, survived only a year or two. Before his marriage he had several mistresses, the latest being Lady Margaret, daughter of the fourth Lord Drummond, the connection being continued until her sudden death in 1501. The deaths of her and her two sisters, after eating an unwholesome dish, was attributed to a plot to sever the connection before the king's marriage. In a letter to Surrey, Margaret Tudor mentions, as "known as truth in all Scotland," that Lord Fleming poisoned the three sisters from his ill-will to one of them [Eupheme], who was his wife; but the tragedy remains a mystery. Margaret Drummond may have been the "mild, meek, mansuete Margaret" of *When Tayis Bank was Blumit Brycht*, probably by Dunbar. By her James had a daughter, Margaret, married to John, Lord Gordon. By Marion Boyd, daughter of Boyd of Bonshaw, he had a son Alexander, educated by Erasmus, who became Archbishop of St Andrews, but fell at Flodden; a son James, who died young; and a daughter, Catherine, married to James, Earl of Morton. By Janet Kennedy he had a son, James, who became Earl of Moray; and by Isabel Stewart, daughter of the Earl of Buchan, a daughter, Jean, married to Malcolm, Lord Fleming: the Lady Fleming who accompanied Queen Mary to France as her governess. He had also various children by other women, including Henry Wemmys, who became Bishop of Galloway.

CHAPTER IV.

JAMES V., THE GUDEMAN OF BALLENGEICH.

BORN at Linlithgow, 10th April 1512, James V., when his father died, was but eighteen months old. The death of three children before him caused his father and mother much anxiety about his health, and occasioned a frequent change of his wet-nurses, one getting her leave "by the king's command," another being rejected because her milk was supposed to be too strong, while also an Irish nurse was employed to give him suck "the time he was sick." The poet, Sir David Lyndsay, then a young man of twenty-two, was appointed his personal attendant, and later was promoted master of his household. In his poetic *Complaynt to the King*, Lyndsay reminds him that he was accustomed to lull him to sleep with his lute, and excite his mirth or arouse his awesome astonishment by dramatic impersonations in "plays and farces on the floor." The boy's principal tutor was Gavin Dunbar, afterwards Archbishop of Glasgow.

Different accounts are given of the date and place of his coronation, though it most probably took place on 21st September 1513 at Stirling, whither his mother had retired with him. By the will of James IV. she was appointed his guardian and regent of the kingdom; but at a Parliament at Perth in October, Archbishop

Beaton and the Earls of Angus, Arran, and Huntly were named a Council, without whose concurrence any act of his would be invalid. By certain lords an invitation was also sent to the Duke of Albany, next heir to the crown, but a naturalised Frenchman, to assume the regency; and this led to a proposal from Louis XII. for a renewal of the ancient league, and the offer to send Albany with men and arms in Scotland's defence. The infant king thus became the centre of a complicated intrigue, in which the principals were Henry VIII., Francis I.—who succeeded Louis XII., 1st December 1515—Margaret, Albany, Angus, Arran, and Archbishop Beaton, and which underwent modifications according to their varying emergencies and aims. Never in her chequered career were the politics of Scotland in a more confused and chaotic condition, or subject to such rapid kaleidoscopic changes. The main constant elements were, on the one hand, the persistent efforts of Henry VIII., not by war—except in a cursory and intermittent fashion—but by underhand contrivance, to get control of the Scottish executive; and, on the other, the inveterate Scottish jealousy of English interference, and haunting dread of the loss of independence.

Flodden spread over Scotland a wave of dismay and terror; but Henry VIII. could not then waste his resources on a Scottish war. Surrey, therefore, instead of continuing his march to Edinburgh, immediately returned south; and though various filibustering raids were made into Scotland, this was mainly to hold the Scots in check. Just before Albany's arrival, Scotland, on 15th May 1515, had been included in a pacification between England and France; but Henry VIII., while seeking, by secret subsidies to the emperor, to thwart the Italian ambitions of Francis I., also set himself, by hook or crook, to drive Albany out of Scotland.

In his latter aim Henry might have succeeded better but for the erotic vagaries of his sister. By her marriage to the handsome Earl of Angus, the Privy Council declared that she had forfeited the regency, whereupon she appealed for help to Henry, who offered her and the young princes an asylum in England. To this she replied, 22nd January 1514-15, that were she "such a woman as might go with her bairn in her arm, she would not be long away from him." An offer of Dacre, on the 26th, to convey her and her children from any place "within ten miles of this side of Stirling," came, however, to nothing; and on the arrival of Albany, Henry instructed Dacre to foment quarrels between Albany and Angus, and between him and Lord Home, so as to make Scotland too hot for him.

For having struck the Lyon Herald when a year before he came to Stirling to summon Angus before the Council, Albany, on the 16th July, sent Lord Drummond, uncle of Angus, to Blackness; and he also placed Gavin Douglas, the elect of Dunkeld, in the sea tower of St Andrews, for having obtained his presentation by a bull of the Pope at the instance of Henry VIII. In opposition to the queen, he further reappointed Archbishop Beaton Chancellor; and Parliament sent to her four nobles that she might select three of them for the guardianship of the young princes. They were, however, denied admittance to the castle. Dacre then arranged with Angus and Home to get the king delivered to him; and this enterprise failing, he advised that should Albany threaten the castle, the queen should set the boy on the walls crowned, with a sceptre in his hand, "so that it shall be manifestly known to all persons that the war shall be made against the king's own person." But on the appearance of Albany at Stirling, on 4th

August, with 1000 men, George Douglas and others fled for their lives, "leaving the queen desolate," and without other choice than to commit her children to the charge of the Earl Marischal and Lords Borthwick and Fleming. Then withdrawing to Blackadder Tower, she was conveyed by forty "hardy and striking fellows," provided by Home, to Dacre's castle of Harbottle, where, shortly afterwards, she gave birth to a daughter, who became the mother of Darnley.

That the official representative of the opposition to Henry VIII. happened to be Albany was unfortunate, less on account of defects in Albany, than because he was not so much the Regent of Scotland as the agent of France. He was sent by France to Scotland mainly to hold Henry VIII. in check; he was withdrawn when his presence there was less essential to France, or when it suited her to pretend to be on specially friendly terms with England.

The near heirship of James V. to the English throne also complicated the situation; and latterly had not a little to do with the strange matrimonial adventures of Henry VIII., which were at once the scandal of the age and the harbingers of English Protestantism. Had the boy's mother been less self-absorbed, had her amatory impulses been less clamant, had she been unselfishly devoted to her son and perfectly loyal to Scotland, she might have helped not a little to smooth the difficulties with her brother. But when her husband died she was only in her twentieth year: she wished to live her life; and by her marriage to Angus she began a career which, matrimonially, was a sort of faint counterpart of that of her brother, and, politically, was as uncertain in its veerings as the weathercock. Her marriage to Angus created, also, a revival of the old traitorous relations of the Douglasses with England,

which introduced a new element of discord into the Scottish politics of the next thirty years.

Another even more lasting source of internal strife now began also to manifest itself. Through descent from the Princess Mary, daughter of James II., James Hamilton, Earl of Arran, was next heir after Albany to the crown, and conceiving that he had better claims than the Frenchman to the regency, his political tactics were directed against both Albany and Angus. After the street fight in 1520, called "Cleanse the Causeway," between the Hamiltons and Douglasses, the influence of Angus became, during a temporary absence of Albany, supreme. Then followed a rupture between Margaret, who in 1517 had returned to Scotland, and Angus, whom, in 1522, Albany kidnapped and sent to France; but by 1523 Angus had made his escape, and was living with his brother George in England under Henry's protection. During Albany's absence in France, Henry suggested the "erection" of the young king, his aim being to put him in the hands of Angus; but Margaret, in co-operation with Arran, undertook the project not in Angus's interest but her own. Having gained over Lennox, Crawford, and others, they, on 26th July, brought the boy from Stirling to Edinburgh and assumed the government in his name.

Meantime Wolsey had been striving to entice the Chancellor Beaton, the leader of the French party, to meet Norfolk on the Borders; not, however, as Wolsey, with pious mendacity affirmed, in order to concur with him to "good and virtuous purpose" . . . "by the grace of Almighty God." As Wolsey explained to Norfolk, the devout proposal was not intended "for any communication of peace," but "only for the purpose of intercepting the Chancellor by means of Angus." Wolsey's traitorous invitation was declined by Beaton; and since the "erection" was not made as he had hoped

in the interest of Angus, the capture of Beaton was of less importance ; but on account of Beaton's opposition to the step taken by Margaret and Arran, both he and the Bishop of Aberdeen were put in ward in Scotland.

Meanwhile, the king's old personal attendants, including Lyndsay and John Bellenden—who had succeeded Gavin Dunbar as tutor—were dismissed ; and he was provided with an establishment of which he was nominally master. But so far as Henry could effect this, he became the ward of his uncle. The old guard of Scottish archers was superseded by two hundred English men-at-arms, of whom Arran undertook the charge. Henry also sought to bind Margaret, Arran, Lennox, and others to his service by liberal bribes, which they made no scruple about accepting ; but the difficulty was that by no manner of means could he persuade Margaret and Arran to consummate the coalition by accepting the partnership of Angus ; and his insistence on the return of Angus caused Margaret and Arran to set Beaton and the Bishop of Aberdeen at liberty. Albany having outstayed the period of his leave of absence in France, Parliament, on 19th November 1424, vested the regency in the queen, supervised by a council, consisting of the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Bishop of Aberdeen, and the Earls of Arran and Argyll. Angus, now let loose by Henry, entered Edinburgh early in the morning of the 23rd, but being fired on from the castle, retired to Tantallon. Followed a coalition of Beaton and the Bishop of Aberdeen with Angus, Lennox, and Argyll, against Margaret and Arran, which compelled her assent to the admission of Angus to the council of regency, though she declined the resumption of matrimonial relations with him. The rupture was due to her infatuated passion for Henry Stewart, younger brother of Lord Evandale. She was

prepared to sacrifice everything—the headship of the government, the good of her brother, even the interests of her son—for the prospective joys of a third marriage. No sooner was Angus admitted to the council of regency than she wrote a letter to Albany asking him to intercede with the King of France for support in her divorce proceedings, and stating that rather than agree with Angus she would leave the country. On 11th January 1527-8 a decree of divorce was granted; but before this Angus had usurped the government.

At the Parliament of July-August 1525, while a three-years' truce of England was agreed to, it was arranged that the guardianship of the king should be shared between a noble and an ecclesiastic, a change being made quarterly. Until 8th November the guardians were to be Angus and the Archbishop of Glasgow; but on the expiry of his term Angus declined to transfer the guardianship to Arran and the Bishop of Aberdeen; and a large force mustered by Arran, when faced by Angus and the king, dispersed without risking a battle. The temporary triumph of Angus only secured for him, however, his sovereign's undying hate, and for Henry, a suspicion and distrust never to be eradicated.

The king having entered into a secret understanding with Lennox for his deliverance, three attempts at a rescue followed, and in the last Lennox was defeated and slain near Linlithgow, by a joint force under Angus and Arran. Angus now took Stirling Castle from Margaret, but returned it, on condition that she put away Stewart; and a kind of concord was established, on the understanding that she should "not solicit for the Archbishop of St Andrews." Shortly thereafter she, however, according to Patrick Sinclair, a spy of Henry VIII., "circumvented Angus, and got his consent that the Archbishop of St

Andrews shall be with the king." At Christmas, Margaret and Beaton, under the auspices of Angus, dined with the king at Holyrood; and at Easter Beaton entertained Angus and his friends in his castle at St Andrews; but the sham reconciliation ceased with the marriage of Margaret and Stewart in April 1528. Followed the siege of Stirling Castle in the king's name, when Margaret delivered up Stewart, who was put in ward; but in the end of May, James, disguised as a groom, made his escape to her in Stirling Castle.

The ascendancy of Angus now collapsed—collapsed as completely as that of the Boyds in the time of James III.; but had he succumbed to his overthrow with a meeker spirit, he might have escaped his worst misfortunes. Declining, however, to obey the order of the Council to confine himself to the north of the Spey, and to send his brother George and his uncle Archibald of Kilspindie as hostages to Edinburgh, he fortified himself in Tantallon. This in September caused his forfeiture for treason, but he still continued in open rebellion. Of the character of his relations with Henry we have, also, a significant glimpse in Henry's instructions to Magnus in October 1528: it would be better, so he opines, that "Angus remain in Scotland doing all the harm he can than come to England." Meantime, however, the activity of Henry against James and Scotland was secret and indirect. Now in a manner allied with France, he was also largely absorbed in the great divorce question, soon to become the sensation of Europe. Unable, therefore, to obtain any direct support from him, Angus had no option but surrender to James or exile in England, and he chose the latter alternative.

The Treaty of Berwick, December 1529, for a five-years' truce between the two countries, stipulated that



From the picture in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire.]

JAMES V. AND MARY OF LORRAINE.

Henry's reception of Angus should not be deemed a violation of the truce, and his remission was to depend on submission, and the goodwill of James. Angus condescended to state that Tantallon and all that was his were at the king's disposal, if "he might be restored to honours and heritage and assured of his life"; but he declined what James deemed sufficient lenient terms. On 2nd December the Lords of the Council therefore wrote to Henry that they did not favour his restoration; and on Henry persisting in efforts to secure it, James finally stated that it could not be granted without great inconvenience, and desired him not to mediate the same. Thus between uncle and nephew there was established an abiding source of difficulty, but for which the oft-mooted marriage between James and the Princess Mary might have taken place—and had it, how different might have been the annals of the two countries and of the royal House of Stewart!

The king, on whom at such a complexly critical period now devolved the chief responsibilities of government, inherited more of the physical than of the mental gifts of his father. Like him, he was of middle height and strongly made; and so hardy was he, that, according to Buchanan, he would remain with his horse out of doors, day and night, to surprise the Border reivers. Inheriting his father's complexion, he was also like him significantly known as "the red tod." His countenance was prepossessing, with pleasant grey eyes, which were nevertheless, according to Leslie, "shrewd and penetrating"; and Ronsard says of him—

*"La douceur et la force illustroient son visage
Si que Venus et Mars en avoient fait partage."*

Still, he was but a weak semblance of his father.

He lacked his personal ascendancy. His ambitions were less ardent, his will less firm, his purpose less persistently resolute.

If not, like his father, an adept in the feats of the tournament, James V. was a keen sportsman. The Lord Treasurer's Accounts show that he kept a large kennel, with at least eight "dog keepers," clad in a livery of green, besides a "master dogger." While under the care of Angus, he requested Magnus to get him from England three or four brace of the best "ratches in the country, for hares, foxes, and greater beasts, and a brace of bloodhounds of the best kind that would ride behind him on horseback"; and at the instance of Magnus, the Duke of Richmond sent him ten couples of foxhounds in charge of his huntsman, who was to remain with him a month to show the method of hunting with them. The Duke also promised to send him the "lyam" hounds as soon as he could obtain them; and in return James forwarded two brace of deerhounds; and if the Duke took pleasure in hawking, engaged to send him "the best red hawks of the realm." James was also addicted to shooting at the butts, and kept an "Ingليس bower."

The premature discontinuance of the king's education—so much regretted by Sir David Lyndsay—which followed his "erection," was not remedied under Angus, who also allowed him every kind of licence in the gratification of his pleasures. Thus, while naturally sharp and clever, he was but imperfectly trained and disciplined. Loving at the age of thirteen to pose as a man, "inasmuch as the swords," relates Magnus, "he deals with are a yard afore the hilt," he was unable to read an English letter; and his French letters of later years exhibit but an indifferent mastery of that language. References by Lyndsay and Bellenden show that he occasionally

dabbled in verse; but his authorship of *Christis Kirk*, or *Peblis to the Play*, is as incredible as that of *The Gaberlunzie Man*, or *The Jollie Beggar*. He was, however, like his father, a patron of poets and scholars; and he inherited artistic sensibilities. He was also specially interested in the useful arts, and, says Pitscottie, "sent and furnished the country with all kinds of craftsmen, such as Frenchmen, Spaniards, and Dutchmen, whichever was the finest of their profession that could be had."

Apart from his "inclinability to women," he was not of particularly voluptuous habits. Unlike his stupendous uncle, he was neither a wine-bibber nor a glutton. Though, also, loving gaiety and display, and something of a dandy, he was not given to flaunt his sovereign dignity. As the "Gudeman of Ballengeich," he loved, like his father, to mingle *incognito* with the humbler of his subjects. Easy, also, of access to those who desired redress, he earned, with all his faults and weaknesses, the highly honourable title of "the poor man's king." His most important achievement was the institution of an improved College of Justice. In affirming that this "Court of the Fifteen"—of which, including the president, eight were ecclesiastics, then the persons most skilled in the law—redounded to his eternal glory, Leslie may have been influenced by ecclesiastical bias; but it is a striking fact that though modified in details the Court of James V. survived both Cromwell and the Union of the Kingdoms, and is still, in essentials, the supreme Court of Law in Scotland. Its establishment in Edinburgh implied the final ratification of that unique city as the capital of the kingdom. As a rallying centre against England, Edinburgh had long possessed a certain tactical supremacy. Already she had, also, had a share of those historic incidents, on

which her rugged picturesqueness seems to confer a certain magic vividness and vitality; but the most pungently impressive of the series were yet to come, and she was more and more to be the seat of the heart and brain of Scotland, just as Paris was and is of France.

In the higher constitutional sense the reign of James was a disastrous failure. He had a harder task than his father, and he was less able to cope with it. While the reign of the father stands out conspicuous for the peculiar loyalty and devotion of the nobles, the outstanding features of the reign of the son are, on the one hand, the break with the nobles, and, on the other, the immense increment in the political influence, affluence, and general corruption of the ecclesiastics. From this almost constitutional revolution, three consequences followed of pregnant moment: the first immediate in its action, the other two more gradual and remote; the first affecting Scotland's relation with England, the others her political and ecclesiastical future. The close alliance of James with the ecclesiastics inevitably widened the breach with Henry, for while this alliance was the cardinal fact in the nephew's reign, the portentous circumstance in that of his uncle was the breach with Rome. Could Henry have prevailed on his nephew to side with him in his great defiance, there would have been no Solway Moss, and no subsequent bloody conflicts. The second consequence of the ecclesiastical alliance was a great decline in the old sovereign authority. In the person of James V. the sovereignty lost much of its old prestige. It never fully recovered from his failure to maintain supremacy over the nobles, and to restrain the political ambition and check the luxurious corruption of the Church. The third consequence of his ecclesiastical entanglement—continued

during the regency of his widow—was greatly to aid the Scottish Reformation in assuming a new form of the old priestly dominance, untempered by the secularity of the civil authority.

There is plenty of evidence that he was far from acquiescent in the graver ecclesiastical corruptions of his time. It was at his instance that Buchanan penned his satire against the Franciscans; by his own royal presence at the play he sanctioned the exposure of the ecclesiastical maladies so scathingly achieved in Sir David Lyndsay's *Pleasant Satyre*; and he made a definite attempt to restrain the inordinate greed of the clergy in the extortion of death duties. But with him ecclesiastical reform became little more than a pious opinion. His efforts were burked by the ecclesiastical opposition of his own council; and from the time that David Beaton, in 1539, succeeded his uncle as Archbishop of St Andrews, use and wont became supreme. Henceforth the ecclesiastics were blindly riding for a fall. Their excessive arrogance enlisted on the side of unauthorised reformers a large number of the nobility, without whose co-operation the reformers would have had a much more difficult and perilous task, and could hardly have triumphed in the extreme and singular fashion that left so peculiar an impress on the average Scot of the three succeeding centuries.

In one particular matter James V. showed resolute energy, though it was insufficiently modified by patience, tact, and discrimination. The private reiving forays into England had become increasingly prevalent, but they had the sanction of an immemorial custom closely linked with patriotism. Without, also, the co-operation of the Southern nobles a mitigation of the evil was hardly possible; but instead of endeavouring to secure this, James, before dealing with the reivers, put the principal nobles in temporary confinement. This high-

handedness, coupled with the indiscriminating severity meted out to the reivers, tended to elevate those otherwise respectable and loyal Scots into patriotic heroes and martyrs. The exploits and tragedies of this wild period are partly commemorated in the Border ballads, which, notwithstanding a partial modern gloss, still pulsate with the venturesome delights, the boisterous triumphs, and the violent griefs of the perilous Border life. The Borderers were amazed that their thieving exploits against their immemorial foes should be rewarded with wholesale execution; and the case, for example, of Johnie Armstrong is summed up thus:—

“John murdered was at Carlingrigg.”

In the case of certain nobles, James showed a similar lack of balance. The forfeiture of the lands of Glamis, and the cruel execution of Lady Glamis and of her son and heir, a youth of sixteen, on the charge of a conspiracy to make away with him by poison or witchcraft, were, though Lady Glamis happened to be the sister of Angus, dictated mainly by panic folly. Then the execution in 1540 of Sir James Hamilton of Finnart, for connection with an old plot against the king in 1528, was apparently a similar criminal blunder. Up to his execution Hamilton, though he had had a chequered career, was a favourite of the king, who so highly estimated his architectural talents as to commit to him the reconstruction of the palaces of Falkland and Linlithgow; and the popular opinion of the king's action against him is shown in the tales as to the haunting of the king in his sleep by Hamilton's spectre.

The general attitude of James to the nobles was irritating rather than effective. Bothwell, Huntly, Moray, Crawford, Argyll, and others, were, on various grounds, deprived of portions of their lands and juris-

dictions; and, in 1540, a special Act was passed confirming their annexation to the crown. He also devoted special attention to augmenting the pecuniary profit of the crown lands by, as Henry—who suggested to him to rob the monasteries—phrased it, “meddling with sheep and other mean things.” He could not accept Henry’s advice, but his annexations, by impairing the loyalty of the nobles, did much to aid Henry in his sinister designs against Scotland.

The estrangement with Henry was further confirmed and brought to a head by the matrimonial alliance with France. The matrimonial projects relating to James V. have been the subject of an elaborate volume by M. Edmund Bapst (Paris, 1889); and further particulars are given in Sir James Balfour Paul’s preface to vol. iv. of the Lord High Treasurer’s Accounts. A definite arrangement was hindered both by his illicit entanglements and the delusive suggestions for a marriage to the Princess Mary of England; later the names of various foreign princesses were mentioned, including Marie, sister of the Emperor and ex-Queen of Hungary, Catherine de Medicis, Marie de Bourbon, Isabeau d’Albert, and the Infanta Marie of Portugal; but the bias of Scottish preference was always towards a princess of the royal house of France. James himself would have preferred his mistress, Margaret Erskine, the mother of the future Regent Moray. After her marriage to Sir Robert Douglas of Lochleven, he even made application for a Papal divorce that he might make her his wife; but this not being granted he had to look elsewhere. Provision for his marriage to the Princess Madeline of France had been made in the revised treaty of Rouen; but subsequently Francis, to avoid giving umbrage to Henry VIII., proposed the substitution of Marie de Bourbon. James, however, declined to be committed blindfold to this, and in 1536 set out to

France on a kind of love quest. In the guise of one of his own officials he appeared *incognito* at the court of the Duke of Vendôme, when his proposed bride having discovered his identity through a portrait of him in her possession, he was received by the parents with great cordiality. But on his going to pay his respects to the King of France, whatever favourable impression Marie de Bourbon may have produced upon him was dissipated by the vision of the brilliant but hectic beauty of the Princess Madeline. In vain Francis made known to him the almost hopeless condition of her health, and advised him to marry the younger sister. The Princess was equally attracted by him, and, in the end, the French king allowed them to have their will. They were married at Notre Dame on New Year's Day, 1537, and shortly thereafter set out for Scotland. But their day-dream was soon over. Delayed for some time at Rouen on account of the lady's serious illness, they landed at Leith on 9th May, and she died at Holyrood on 7th June.

While in France, James had seen and admired Marie, daughter of the Duc de Guise and widow of the Duc de Longueville; and in the spring of 1538 he sent David Beaton with a proposal for her hand. The acquiescence of Francis I. was just in time to frustrate the effort of Henry VIII.—again a widower by the death of Jane Seymour—to obtain the same lady's hand. Shortly after the marriage by proxy on 18th May, she set sail for Scotland, and landing at Crail on 18th June, she received the nuptial blessing at St Andrews on the following day.

The marriage was a double wound to the inordinate pride of Henry VIII. The outbreak of hostilities now depended simply on the relations between Henry and Francis I., which were becoming more and more doubtful. When they became strained, Henry sought to

come to terms with James, who, however, was largely swayed by the counsels of David Beaton, now Cardinal-Archbishop, and necessarily opposed to any alliance with a king at feud with Rome. In seeking, in the autumn of 1541, to persuade his nephew to a conference at York, Henry also made it, at the same time, clear that cordial friendship with him would be impossible except by concession to his ecclesiastical opinions. Though desirous to appear so far conciliatory, James did not commit himself to a definite acceptance of the invitation; and if Henry's expectations of thus securing the person of his nephew—for this was what he meant to do—were disappointed, he had partly to thank his sanguine over-confidence. But James was on the horns of a dilemma; though he could not agree to his uncle's terms, it was difficult to defy him, and this because he could not be sure of the support of the nobles. On account of the capture of Sir Robert Bowes when engaged in a raid on the Scottish Borders, Henry deputed the Duke of Norfolk with a force of twenty thousand to ravage the Lothians; but when, in retaliation, James resolved to carry fire and sword into Northumberland the nobles refused to support him. It was an almost insufferable humiliation; but if, as Beaton informed him, no fewer than three hundred nobles and barons, of whom he received from Beaton a list, were infected with heresy, and in sympathy with Henry VIII., then the only prudent policy of James meanwhile was to bear with the affront. Instead of doing so, he, however, sent to ravage Cumberland a force which, though effective as a raiding and plundering horde, lacked organisation and unity. The nomination of his favourite, Oliver Sinclair, as its commander, engendered also confusion and distrust; and when, as they were returning, the Scots in the gathering dusk of 23rd November 1542 were suddenly

attacked between the Esk and the Solway Moss, they were seized by panic and with hardly a show of resistance scattered into the Moss, where many were drowned and over 1200 taken prisoners. It has now been proved that instead of 400 or 500 the English numbered some 2000; but even so, 2000 Englishmen would, in ordinary circumstances, be as little as 500 a match for 10,000 Scots.

But humiliating as was the disaster of Solway Moss, it bore no comparison with the great catastrophe of Flodden. It was not in itself sufficient to account for the extreme mortification, amounting to despair, with which it filled the king. What preceded it has to be considered, and what he knew of the treacherous tendencies of the nobles. The overwhelming conviction was borne in upon him that he had lost the full loyalty of his subjects, and that he was no longer in a position to guide the nation's destiny. This, apparently, was the "suddane fear and astonishment" with which, according to Knox, he was stricken; or, as Pitscottie puts it, he was "in despair that he could nevir recover his honour agane"; or, as Sir George Douglas reported, "The Scotis Kyng ys rycht feryd for losying of his holl realme, . . . he is so abbayshid that he can not perfytyly determine what he should do." His grief and despair seem to have superinduced an acute nervous derangement or some kind of fever. There is no evidence that he consulted the council, or even the cardinal, about the situation. He spent some time in a listlessly dolorous condition in Edinburgh, and after visiting the queen at Linlithgow, crossed over, on 6th December, from Edinburgh to Fife, and going on to Falkland at once took to his bed. With the hopeless resignation of a mortally-wounded animal he had retired to his lair to die. The news of the queen's delivery of a daughter only added to his gloomy despondency.

“It”—the sovereignty of the Stewarts—“cam,” he said, “with a lass, and it will pass with a lass”; and, after some days of delirium, he passed away at midnight of the 14th or 15th December 1542. His body was buried in January beside that of his wife Magdalen, in the Abbey Church of Holyrood.

Tragically sad as was the end of James V., his death was by no means to the disadvantage of Scotland. It is hard to say what might have happened to her had he survived; but the condition of the dynasty or of the Scottish nation did not turn out to be so desperate as he imagined. His reign was to be calamitous mainly to the Church of Rome. This was its vital consequence. He was not himself an epoch-making king. He was neither wise nor strong enough for his difficult task; but by his very weaknesses and mistakes he did not a little to hasten and shape the coming ecclesiastical revolution.

Besides his daughter Mary, James, by Marie de Guise, had two sons who died in infancy within a few days of each other. His son James by Margaret, daughter of the fifth Lord Erskine, became Regent of Scotland. By Elizabeth, daughter of Shaw of Sauchie, he had an elder James, Abbot of Kelso and Melrose; by Euphemia, daughter of Lord Elphinstone, Robert, Prior of Holyrood and Earl of Orkney; by Elizabeth, daughter of Lord Carmichael, John, Prior of Coldingham; by Lady Jane Hepburn, sister of the fourth Earl Bothwell, Francis, fifth Earl of Bothwell; and by Elizabeth Stewart, daughter of the Earl of Lennox, Adam, Prior of the Carthusians at Perth. A daughter Janet, by Elizabeth Carmichael, was married to the fifth Earl of Argyll, and there was a child by Elizabeth Paton, of whom nothing is known.

CHAPTER V.

MARY.—UNTIL THE MARRIAGE TO DARNLEY.

BORN at Linlithgow on 7th or 8th December 1542, while the heavy gloom of the Solway disaster enveloped the nation and her father lay sick unto death at Falkland, Mary inherited as Scottish sovereign little else than peril, difficulty, and sorrow. The great intrigue of Henry VIII. to get her and Scotland into his hands signally failed, but its consequences were to colour her whole after-life down to the execution at Fotheringay. Before he left the world Henry determined to revenge himself by an arrangement for debarring the Scottish dynasty from the English throne; and he also, on his deathbed, gave injunctions that the old policy of violence should be persevered in. But his hopes of its posthumous triumph were dismally belied. The brutalities of Somerset were as ineffective as his own. Even after the rout of Pinkie Cleugh, 8th September 1547, the Scots remained as resolute as ever to "defend their auld liberties." That sore reverse but drove them to bargain with France for assistance; and the price they had to pay for it was the affiancement of Mary to the Dauphin of France and her transference to that country.

To the furtherance of this momentous arrangement other events had also co-operated. When the proposal

was first made for her affiance to Edward VI. the French throne was occupied by Francis I., and he who became the Dauphin of France was then unborn. Until, also, the accession of Henry II., the French marriage remained no more than a possibility. His accession was, in itself, an important step towards its accomplishment, for Henry's policy was guided largely by the Guises; and the queen-dowager was also better able to have her own way. The proposed affiance was, it is true, regarded by not a few Scots with mistrust; and the child's transference to France was unpalatable to many more. Both proposals were, also, more particularly displeasing to Arran, next heir to the crown, who, influenced in his opposition to England by the hope of his son's marriage to Mary, could hardly regard the gift from the French king of the Dukedom of Châtellerauld a sufficient solace for his great disappointment. But Arran lacked the initiative and the talent to dominate the situation. As more than once before and oftener in the years to come, he had, with however bad grace, to submit to an unpleasant compliance with necessity. The danger of the crisis appealed strongly to the more patriotic nobles; the more doubtful and selfish were won by flatteries, bribes, and French titles of honour; the skilled help of the French at the siege of Haddington added greatly to the effect of the queen-dowager's advocacy; and at a meeting of the Estates in the Abbey, on 1st July 1548, the proposal for the young queen's affiance to the Dauphin and her transference to France was agreed to without demur.

Unlike her dead brothers, Mary was strong and healthy—"as goodly a child," reported the English ambassador, Sadler, as he had "seen of her age," her only illnesses of moment being the almost inevitable children's epidemics, chicken-pox and measles. In July 1543 she was removed from Linlithgow to Stirling

Castle ; on Hertford's descent on Edinburgh in May 1544 she was sent to Dunkeld, and after Pinkie in 1547 to the monastery of Inchmahome, a secluded island on the Lake of Menteith ; but she returned to Stirling as soon as Hertford retired south ; and the memories of her early childhood were associated mainly with the stronghold on the rock overlooking the narrow plain with its towering mountains to the west and north, and watered by the winding and expanding Forth. For companions she had the four Marys, daughters respectively of the houses of Fleming, Livingstone, Seton, and Beaton of Creich. Accompanying her to France and returning with her to Scotland, they all entertained towards her a strong affection during the whole chequered course of her subsequent career. A threatened expedition under Grey of Walton caused the child's removal on the last day of February 1548 to Dumbarton Castle ; and on 21st July she embarked for France, but the galleys lay at anchor until 7th August, when an easterly wind sprang up, and some ten days afterwards she landed at the small port of Roscoff, near Brest.

From her early years Mary was noted for qualities that attracted and fascinated. If in repose her countenance was not exceptionally beautiful, it possessed a peculiar witchery when lit up with sentiment and emotion. Thus Catherine de Medicis writes of her when a mere child : " This small Queen of Scots has only to smile in order to turn all French heads." It was her personality more than her features that fascinated : her graceful bearing, her pleasant tones, her ardent emotionalism, and her sprightly and genial manners. It is worthy of note, also, that she was more prevailing in her friendships than in her loves. Though her love episodes wrecked her life, she inspired no very notable love passion. The case of Châtelard may be cited ; but he, remarkable neither as

man nor poet, was, if without sinister motives, the victim as much of vanity as love. If again Arran was more enamoured than ambitious, his passion may have been but a phase of his mental malady. Later, when shame and calamity had befallen her, she utilised George Douglas to deliver her from Lochleven; but his case was only temporary, and a mere mixture of chivalrous loyalty, calf love, and foolish ambition, created by arts quite within the power of an experienced royal lady of average attractiveness. On the other hand, her hold over Darnley and Bothwell, to whom jointly she largely owed her evil doom, was notoriously weak.

As the betrothed of the Dauphin and prospective Queen Consort of France, Mary was trained and educated in a very thorough manner. She was an adept in the fashionable accomplishments of the time—dancing of the elaborate and individual character then in vogue, elocution, dramatic impersonation, singing, and playing on the zithern, the harp, and the virginals; while the more solid part of her education embraced composition in verse as well as prose, and instruction in Latin as well as in the chief modern languages. From her early years, also, her habits, morals, and religion were carefully attended to by the king's mistress and chief confidant, Diana of Poitiers, who was very particular that the royal children should have preceptors who should instruct them as "well in virtue and wise precepts as in the love and fear of God." Lady Fleming, her aunt and special guardian, had, in 1557, to return to Scotland on account of her affair with the French king; and she was succeeded by Madame de Paroy, a pious and scrupulous lady past middle life, whose influence was, in several ways, beneficial, although her stern and stiff notions caused some resentment as Mary approached womanhood. From the time of her marriage her chief confidant and

guide was her maternal grandmother, Antoinette de Bourbon, to whom, as to her Guise relations, she was very strongly attached.

Religion—the Catholic religion—was the great stalking-horse of the Guises, and the master-spirit of the family was the Cardinal of Lorraine. His chief concern about his niece was that she should become a discreet and fitting consort for the future sovereign of France, and a trained and pliable instrument for the promotion of the higher interests of the Catholic religion and the house of Guise. Other interests and inclinations were, in her case, subordinated to ambition—the cardinal's even more than her own.

To the sickly, languid, and peevish Dauphin, Mary became a most patient and considerate wife. Her duties to him she discharged with a sympathetic tenderness that even evokes a kind of wonder. But she had, of course, some special consolations. Her personal influence over him she utilised for her own gratification and the advancement of her relatives of Guise into positions of high trust, emolument, and authority. She had also the social recompenses which many women deem the highest form of earthly bliss. For a short time she was the Queen Consort of France and the predominating spirit of the most brilliant social circle in Europe. But with all its varied felicities and splendours, her matrimonial adventure was a most luckless one, even had her wedlock endured; but it did not endure long, and thus the stage was cleared for the commencement of a new tragedy.

The splendid position of Queen Consort of France, on which the hopes of the Guises had been concentrated from her childhood, was hers for but a short time. She was married on 19th April 1558; her husband succeeded to the throne 10th July 1559; and he died on 5th December 1560. His death would have mattered less

to her and her relations had he left a son and heir ; but there was an almost dumfounding contrast between the possibilities of splendour she and they might have shared and the beggarly nature of the actual reality. It was not merely that she had to yield pride of place to Catherine de Medicis, the mother of the young Charles IX., but on account of her hostile relations with Catherine, her presence at the court had become impossible, while her betrothal to Charles, an arrangement as desirable for France as for her, was quite debarred.

Momentarily her gloomy outlook was lightened by the possibility of marriage to Don Carlos of Spain. To the cardinal, besides redeeming his fallen state in France, it would greatly enhance his ecclesiastical prestige. For Mary it, of necessity, meant severance from France, the land of her dearest affections ; but this was otherwise hardly avoidable, and, on the other hand, it might be deemed an even more brilliant match than that to Charles IX. But this great ambition of her and the cardinal was quickly frustrated by Catherine de Medicis, whose violent menaces so intimidated the discreet Philip that he broke off negotiations. There was, however, the possibility of their renewal, should a change in the political situation lessen to Philip the risks of the arrangement and bring the splendid possible advantages more within his grasp. Once secure as regards Scotland, Mary might flatter herself that neither the crown of England nor the consortship of Spain was beyond her reach.

The thirteen years of Mary's residence in France had, however, been momentous years for Scotland. In that short period time had been almost preternaturally busy. The old Catholic Church of many bygone centuries, with its elaborate architecture and art and imposing ritual, its beautiful churches and cathedrals, its stately and wealthy abbeys, its high and potent

dignitaries, and its crowds of priests, monks, and nuns, had dissolved like the fabric of a vision. Its all-pervading influences had dispersed and disappeared with an almost magical swiftness. Unlike that of England, the ecclesiastical transformation was in appearance complete; for it had been effected less by the rulers or the government than by a kind of national revolt.

Such a rapid collapse of so great and wonderful an institution implied a long process of dry-rot, an almost complete internal decay. The forms and formulas remained but the spirit had fled. While the bulk of the community clung to the old supernaturalism, and, in substance, to the ancient certitudes of the Catholic theology, their common-sense had revolted against the divine pretensions of officials so inefficient, worldly, and openly indecent. But the great collapse had been aided, also, by co-operating external causes. It had been hastened by the queen-dowager's recourse to French aid against the Reformation movement. Then there was the long-standing jealousy between the nobles and the ecclesiastics, which had enormously increased during the ambitious dominance of Beaton. Above all, with the hour had also come the man. The man was Knox. But for him the overthrow of the old organisation could hardly have been consummated so smoothly, swiftly, and effectually. His qualifications for his task were of a mingled kind. He was aided by his defects as well as by his abilities; and while, from the standpoint of his friends, the character of his achievement tends to magnify his greatness, from the standpoint of his enemies it tends to exaggerate his faults. Even by many Presbyterian Scots his achievement is not now deemed so wonderful or immaculate as it was aforetime thought to be. He was also greatly advantaged by the labours of earlier sufferers and martyrs,

by various co-operating causes, and by the rising tide of popular opinion. But whatever the limitations or imperfections of his re-edifications, he was a quite matchless iconoclast. The character of his genius and the cast of his temperament were specially well adapted for the work he had on hand. Though in certain respects a stern moralist, he was not infected with the narrow rigidity of the religious recluse. His tendencies were hardly ascetic; he was not so puritanical as his ecclesiastical successors. He was a full-blooded man, a lover of sociality and good living, and a racy humourist. His immense egoism, his vehement convictions, and his burning zeal were combined with great practical shrewdness and a wisdom which was worldly as well as godly. While delighting and rousing the multitude by his coarsely pungent diatribes against the monks and priests, and enthraling them by the rhetoric of his own prophetic pretensions, he also devoted much skilful wirepulling to the task of winning the support of the nobles.

But, withal, he was the child of the earlier ages: it was both his strength and his weakness to be unquickened by the illumination of the Renaissance. He was a Bible-intoxicated man, and intoxicated by the spirit rather of the Old than of the New Testament, the spirit of the Prophets rather than that of the Apostles. He was a kind of Scots Elijah, sent, as he supposed, by God to the modern Scottish Israel, which had "forsaken the commandments of the Lord," and was following "the false Prophets of Baal." He had not a good word to say for the great institution which had been revered for centuries as the Church of God. He summarily reprobated it as the Antichrist predicted in the Scriptures. Its officials he declared to be the ministers of Satan, its beautiful buildings to be monuments of idolatry, and its gorgeous ritual to be tainted with the

same awful iniquity. Whatever, also, the exaggeration of his tremendous indictment, it was not quite baseless : the Scottish Catholic Church could, in the time of Knox, hardly be termed an excellent specimen of a divine institution. Knox further affirmed that its pretensions did not stand the test of the Scriptures, which now for the first time began to be read by the people, and were read as "the Word of God." Testing the Church of Rome by this remarkable book—this wondrous exposition of the mystery of life and death, this unique amalgam of miracles and morals—it was easy to make out a strong case against its latter-day developments. Nor was Knox the man to hesitate in the use of superlatives. His colouring lacked nothing in luridness, and he inspired his followers with a holy horror of it which became traditional.

In later times a similar detestation overtook the Catholic Church in France—a similar, yet different ; for, unlike the French, the Scots did not in renouncing Catholicism renounce Christianity. Under the guidance of Knox, they sought to substitute for the infallibility of the Pope the infallibility of the Bible, and to found a new kirk in accordance with the divine directions which they persuaded themselves it contained. But the new kirk, however zealous for righteousness it might be, immediately became as arrogant, despotic, and intolerant as the old one. It not only invited but *compelled* every one who had come to years of discretion to join its membership ; and reviving Jewish rather than Christian enactments, it proclaimed that all who persisted in observing the old Catholic "idolatries" should "die the death."

How could the beloved niece of the Cardinal of Lorraine dare to venture near this hornet's nest of Protestant extremists ? Probably neither she nor the Cardinal had more than a vague notion of the character

and extent of the Reformation movement in Scotland; and whatever misgivings she may have cherished must have been largely modified by the extremely friendly attitude of her half-brother, Lord James Stewart, the political leader of the Reformers. Lord James, as the delegate of the Reformers, virtually invited her to Scotland on the understanding that, while she was not to interfere with the religion of her subjects, her own religion was not to be interfered with. His partial blessing rendered her position for the time being secure, and she might well count on much more. The mere glamour of her sovereign presence could not but have its effect on a nation whose history was intertwined so intimately with the deeds and fortunes of her royal ancestors.

But for this momentous proposal, Lord James lacked the sanction of Knox. Knox specially insisted on the disallowance to her of the mass either publicly or privately. To this Lord James circumspectly replied that he could hardly prevent her having mass secretly in her chamber; and this partial defection of his right-hand man among the nobles, placed Knox in perhaps the most unpleasant moral predicament of his life. After the quasi-public celebration of her first mass, he declared, in a heated sermon, that one mass was more fearful to him than the landing of ten thousand armed men to suppress the whole religion. Yet he was content with his rhetorical protest, this although, had he but said the word, "God's judgment would have been executed against idolaters."

It was Lord James who was mainly to blame for the partial recreancy of Knox. He had taken the royal "idolatress" under his patronage, and provided her with opportunity for her wicked incantations. Was he then an insincere and faltering Protestant? By no means; he could not be other than the rigorous

Protestant Calvinist that he seemed to be. But he was in a desperate dilemma. Of the result of opposition to his sister he was far from certain; and immaculate Protestant though he was, he preferred to discover a *via media* that would guard his own private interests as well as those of religion. Had he also his sister's best interests at heart? It is hard to tell, though with the ban of bastardy upon him, he was not likely to be strongly devoted to the fortunes of a sister born in lawful wedlock. Nor was Knox greatly impressed with his plea that but for the hope of his sister's conversion, he would be as great an enemy to her as Knox. Indeed he was soon to abandon it for the proposition of the more secular nobles and Maitland, that subjects cannot interfere with the religion of the sovereign; and he thus found himself involved in a long course of devious action, from which, in the end, he emerged triumphant, so far as his worldly and his Protestant interests and the Protestantism of Scotland were concerned, but not quite scatheless as regards his honesty or his honour.

While, in this matter, the evil genius of Knox had been Lord James, the main constrainer of Lord James was William Maitland of Lethington. Maitland was more a political than a religious Protestant, and he had a strong repugnance to ecclesiastical interference in civil affairs. It was mainly through him that the less "precise" nobles had been induced to join the Protestants; he was virtually their political head as much as Knox was that of the "precise" religionists; and in the proposition that subjects—that is ecclesiastics—could not interfere with the sovereign's religion, he had the bulk of the nobles with him.

Even had Mary had to face the opposition of Lord James as well as Knox, her case in Scotland might not have been hopeless. Ecclesiastical opinion there was still in a condition of partial fluidity; the customs of

the past had a strong hold on the superstitious affections of many; and under the auspices of a popular sovereign a great reaction in favour of the old religion was more than possible; but what she and her advisers had to consider was her relations with England and Elizabeth; and friendly relations with Elizabeth were possible only under the auspices of Lord James and Maitland.

Confidence between the two sovereigns was impeded by the destiny which made them rival claimants to the English throne. By the will of Henry VIII. Mary was debarred from succeeding even should Elizabeth die childless; and, according to Catholic doctrine, Elizabeth was merely a bastard usurping Mary's throne. Then the situation had been aggravated by—after the death of Mary Tudor—the Scottish Queen's proclamation in Paris as Queen also of England and Ireland; by her and her husband's assumption of the English arms; and by their refusal to ratify the treaty of Edinburgh, of July 1560, binding them henceforth to renounce all claims to the English throne. On the eve of her return to Scotland, Mary still declined to ratify the treaty until she consulted the Parliament; and thereupon Elizabeth, professing to view her arrival in Scotland as a menace to her sovereignty, proposed to prevent her return by force; but Mary having stated that she would be guided by the opinions of her subjects, Elizabeth at last wrote that she had suspended her "concept of all unkindness."

Though Mary's Catholic advisers were, of course, bent on the promotion of Catholicism in both countries, this did not imply the expectation that Mary should act a deceptive part towards Elizabeth; the character of their references to Elizabeth show that they did not despair of her return to the old faith. To say the least, she was not so extreme a Protestant as the majority

of the Protestants; her own leanings seemed to be rather towards Catholicism. To de Feria, the Spanish ambassador, she professed to believe almost as the Catholics believed; and nearly to the last, she continued to coquet with Catholic princes and other Catholic temptations. Should the Scottish Queen admit her title, this might, it was thought, greatly modify her attitude to the old faith.

But these anticipations were based on an entire misreading of Elizabeth. She was unalterably wedded to Protestantism; she had ingenuity sufficient to regard herself as, from the Protestant point of view, legitimate, whereas Catholicism afforded her no semblance of shelter from reproach. Also, in certain important respects, she was her father's daughter,—as intensely English as he, which her elder sister had not been; and, with but the faintest interest in ecclesiastical disputes, she resembled him in her masterfulness, her inordinate self-regard, her unscrupulousness and her callousness in the sacrifice of others.

Thus the hope that, for any kind of consideration, Elizabeth would enter into any arrangement implicating her in the acknowledgment of the Papacy, was a vain dream; and equally vain was it to suppose that she would come to an arrangement with Mary on any terms that Mary could accept. Her attitude towards her was very much that of all her predecessors on the English throne towards the rulers of rude and rebellious Scotland. In the beginning her position amounted to this: that Mary should formally recognise her title to the English crown, so as to endanger Mary's own title to it; and latterly to this, that Mary should place herself in her hands both as to her marriage and her rights to the succession.

It is thus vain to ask whether, to secure the admission of her title, Mary would have renounced Catholicism, for

Elizabeth's dubious attitude never permitted the question to become one of practical politics. True, Mary did proceed against the Catholic Huntly, but, apart from the contumacy of his son, she desired to prevent any premature attempts at a Catholic rising. Her first aim was to persuade Elizabeth to agree to her marriage with Don Carlos. This she hoped to secure through an interview with Elizabeth. Suggested by Mary in a private letter, the proposed interview was then mooted by Cecil to Maitland; and on 20th May 1562 Maitland set out for England to arrange for it. The main instructions from the Scottish Council—who knew nothing of Mary's Don Carlos aspirations—were that Mary was not to be pressed with any matters prejudicial to the realm, and that should Elizabeth require the ratification of the treaty as it stood, the meeting should not take place. But almost as soon as the meeting had been arranged to take place in the autumn, the outbreak of hostilities in France caused Elizabeth to defer it till the following summer. Moreover, she sent assistance to the Huguenots against the Duke of Guise; and this, professedly, because Philip was in league with him to place Mary on the throne of England.

Shortly afterwards Mary also learned that during Elizabeth's dangerous illness the Council were almost unanimous against the recommendation of Mary as her successor. These various incidents seemed to shed a new light on Elizabeth's diplomacy. They suggested to Mary—so Maitland informed de Quadra—that Elizabeth's aim had been merely to keep her in suspense about the marriage, or even to force her into a marriage with Arran or some meaner suitor. Henceforth, therefore, her prevailing sentiment towards Elizabeth was distrust, although she hoped to bring pressure to bear on her through the Duke of Guise in

connection with the French negotiations. In February 1563, Maitland was therefore sent to England to mediate between Elizabeth and France and Elizabeth and Mary, and to guard Mary's interest in connection with any discussion in the forthcoming Parliament. But, even if willing, Elizabeth could not have obtained a parliamentary decision in Mary's favour. With the best intentions, she could not have done better for her, meanwhile, than she did. She secured an indefinite postponement of the subject, so far a harmless result, but one more satisfactory to herself than to Mary.

Before the parliamentary discussion the Duke of Guise had, on 24th February, fallen by the shot of Poltrot; and Mary thus lost the friendship of the most reliable of her uncles and his possible aid in arranging a settlement with Elizabeth. But what was the arrangement she desired? Marriage to Don Carlos; and now convinced that Elizabeth would not acquiesce in this, Maitland, at Mary's instance, broached the matter to the Spanish ambassador in London.

With Maitland the externalities of religion were not of vital consequence, and he was far from partial to the dominance of Knox. He was a strong, maybe a rash, political patriot; he was loyal, possibly foolishly loyal, to his sovereign, and his welfare was now largely dependent on her goodwill; but he was not hampered by the strong Protestant bonds of Moray, and he may have persuaded himself that the course he now took was—considering the strong bent of Mary's desires, the lofty attitude of the English Parliament, and the fickleness of Elizabeth—the best now available, in the interests alike of Scotland and Mary. But how to account for the acquiescence of her "precise" brother? Maitland did not doubt that he had scruples, but to the Spanish ambassador he gave it as his opinion that his enmity to Châtelherault and his son, next heirs to the

crown, would make him go very far—a notion which seems to throw a flood of light on the hitherto cordial relations between brother and sister. First created Earl of Mar and then Earl of Moray, Lord James had lately been gifted with a large extent of territory filched from the Catholic Earl of Huntly. Meanwhile, though he had failed to convert his sister to Protestantism, he had continued to stand in the Protestant breach. But had he given up the hope of standing there longer? By no means. Should his sister marry the Spanish heir, it would mean either opposition to her in Scotland or her departure for Spain. In any case, it seemed to promise the supremacy of Moray in Scotland. It was a most pleasing and goodly prospect; while it appealed to his ambition, it might mean the salvation of Scottish Protestantism.

Mary's devotion to the Spanish day-dream is excusable enough. If there is need of explanation for Moray and Maitland, it is different with her. If they had doubts and qualms, she had none. Politically, it was the most brilliant of all possible matches; and it looked like the only feasible, and might well seem beyond comparison the best, solution of her difficulties. Yet by a curious irony it was to be prevented, not by her Protestant enemies, but by her Catholic friends. Its effectual opponent turned out to be, not Elizabeth, Cecil, Moray, or Knox, but her uncle of Lorraine, with whose interests it no longer squared. He took upon him to negotiate for the Archduke of Austria, and induced the Pope to inform Philip that he favoured this marriage. Thereupon Philip, after pondering the various aspects of the question—his son's characteristics, Mary's situation, and the attitude of France—decided not to proceed further with the negotiations. But would Mary marry the Archduke? No. It would have been a political fatuity. It would not have

advantaged her uncle, whose sole aim was to prevent the Spanish marriage; it would not have benefited the Pope, for it would have meant her loss of the Scottish crown. And as for herself, even had she succeeded in retaining the Scottish crown, she would, instead of furthering her attainment of the English one, have rendered this all but hopeless.

But by the failure of the Spanish negotiations her position towards Elizabeth underwent, unknown to Elizabeth, a momentous change. Though she might distrust her as much as ever, she could not now afford to defy her. Moreover, her painful rebuffs from the Papal authorities had severely tried her attachment to Catholicism. Previously she had affirmed to Maitland that she would not marry a Protestant, if he was lord of half the world; and Maitland was of opinion—at least he said so to de Quadra—that she would not take “a husband, Catholic or Protestant, from the hand of the Queen of England, even if by this act alone she could be declared her successor.” But she could hardly, now, maintain the old high fastidiousness: it was not now so certain that she would not take even a Protestant husband from Elizabeth’s hands. Happily Elizabeth was unaware of her bafflement as regards Don Carlos, and her resolve not to marry the Archduke. She was in dread of one or other possibility, and therefore, without any suggestion on the part of Mary or Maitland, she, after various indefinite, if high-sounding, indications, made offer to her of her own notorious lover, Lord Dudley, whom, in token of her desire for the success of his suit, she created Earl of Leicester.

But although Mary permitted negotiations towards this end to proceed, she never had any strong belief in the sincerity of Elizabeth’s offer. To obtain light on this cardinal point she sent Sir James Melville to London; and in Elizabeth he could find neither

“plain dealing nor upright meaning,” and he was more than confirmed as to her deceitfulness by Leicester himself. Moreover, Mary much preferred a marriage to Darnley—eldest son of Lord Lennox and Lady Margaret Douglas—who was both heir after her to the English, and a near heir to the Scottish throne. She therefore, through Sir James Melville, and with, for whatever reason, the consent of Elizabeth, took means to secure Darnley’s visit to Scotland, whither his father had preceded him.

The first meeting between Mary and him, whose marriage to her was to be so tragical for both, took place on 18th February 1564-5 at Wemyss Castle in Fife, where she spent the evening in his company. They next met in Edinburgh, on Sunday evening the 26th, under the auspices of Moray, when, after she had displayed her accomplishments as a dancer, the two, at Moray’s suggestion, danced a galliard together. They were afterwards frequently together, her partiality for her cousin’s company being attributed by Randolph to her “own courteous good nature.” Meantime, the Leicester negotiations continued to hang fire, until a message reached Mary, through Randolph, that Elizabeth, while willing to give her her best goodwill should she marry Leicester, was resolved to leave the succession question unsettled until she had decided whether she herself should marry or not. Mary, therefore, sent Maitland to London to resume negotiations for the Spanish marriage, and, should that be beyond hope, to obtain Spain’s goodwill for a marriage to Darnley, after which Mary’s desire for it was to be mentioned to Elizabeth, with a view to secure her friendly assent.

As soon as she knew of Elizabeth’s violent repugnance to the Darnley marriage, Mary proceeded to secure the signature of the nobles in its support. Further, she despatched a messenger to intercept Maitland,

that he might return with a defiant communication to Elizabeth, and proceed thereafter to France to secure the diplomatic support of the French king. But these emotional commands Maitland deemed it advisable to disregard. Instead of adding fuel to the fire of Elizabeth's wrath, he preferred to seek to soothe it. To his advice Mary also succumbed, and, while adhering to her purpose to marry Darnley, agreed to refer other points of difference to a joint commission of the two countries.

The ultimate opinion of Knox was that "in her heart Elizabeth was not angry at that marriage," more particularly because had Mary "married a foreign prince, it had been an access to her greatness"; but Knox was ignorant of much that is known to us. With a kind of awkward desperation Elizabeth had been striving to prevent Mary's marriage to a foreign suitor; but she did not desire "the access to her greatness" that might follow the marriage to Darnley, and therefore would not even condescend to consider terms about the Darnley marriage.

The implacable hostility both of Elizabeth and Knox to anything that might advantage Mary is easy to understand. With painfully repressed fervour the conscientious Knox had been waiting his opportunity to effect his sovereign's ruin; but he was not shocked at the proposed marriage: he was shocked and alarmed at the possibility of an "idolatrous Jezebel" making good her position as sovereign of Scotland and heir to the English crown.

But what of the new attitude of Moray to his sister? With the "idolatrous Jezebel" he had for years been on the best of terms; and while deprecating the marriage, he had allowed himself to be named as commissioner to treat about terms with Elizabeth. Also while now declining to leave her religion—both "be-

cause she believed it to be well grounded," and because she would lose thereby "the favour of the King of France and other princes her confederates"—Mary was prepared to leave "the establishment of religion in the realm to the determination of the three Estates in Parliament." Yet it is easily credible that Moray's Protestant conscience had long been pricking him. True, his triumph would be at his sister's expense: it would mean her dethronement and perhaps her death; but in his estimate the cause was doubtless the cause of God, and in promoting it there is no clear evidence that he was hampered by strong brotherly affection.

If, again, Mary's motives were selfish more than patriotic and her conduct exceedingly headstrong, certain features in her case appeal strongly to our sympathy. Taught to entertain grandiose ambitions, she had lately been sorely thwarted in them by her friends as well as by her enemies; and having now to rely mainly on her own help and counsel, circumstances forced on her an almost immediate decision. Should this providential opportunity of marrying Darnley be let slip, most assuredly she would not get another; besides which, she would allow a rival claimant to the English throne to return as her rejected suitor to England. Nor was there any other feasible suitor. Less than ever could she take a husband from Elizabeth's hands; there was no fitting Scottish suitor; and her marriage to a foreigner would bring on her the joint wrath of Elizabeth and the Protestants with much less chance of triumph than if she married Darnley. Her only prospect would thus be an indefinite prolongation of widowhood, and the continuance of her perilous and almost intolerable prospect of a merely nominal sovereignty; while by doubling her chances of the English succession, she strengthened her position both in Scotland and in England.

Was the marriage also a kind of love match? In itself this is unlikely; and she had been taught to look at marriage mainly as a political benefit. Still Darnley was, after a fashion, a personable suitor enough. A tall, strong, well-proportioned, yellow-haired lad, he carried himself well. His weakness of character was partly concealed by his youthful pride and self-assurance; and if a little dull-witted, he possessed sparkling animal spirits. He was also a proficient in sports and manly exercises, and he had been carefully trained by his mother in the deportment and accomplishments fitted to win him favour in the eyes of the Queen of Scots. Young and inexperienced, he was naturally a little puffed up by her flattering reception of him and his great expectations; but if she thought him rather foolish, she, an experienced widow, had probably no little faith in her power to cajole and persuade. Whatever, also, her opinion of him, a long course of events had, to a marvel, conspired in his favour. She had really no other outgate than to marry him and risk whatever the dubious fates might bring her of joy and sorrow—risk even misery and defeat, if she was to have a chance of the glorious triumphs which she was fain to hope were in store for her.

This great crisis in her life disclosed quite new traits in Mary's character. During the Huntly campaign her gay hardihood had quite surprised Randolph; but the issues she had now to face were much more serious. They called for quite a new experiment in self-reliance. Hitherto she had been known mainly as the submissive political disciple of her uncles, and latterly, in a measure, of Moray and Maitland, the light-hearted and brilliant hostess of a jovial court and the chief of

“A bevy of fair women richly gay.”

But confronted with the great crisis, she revealed

quite unsuspected attributes. She needed now no political dry-nurse. She was in wild revolt against what she deemed the injustice and wrong she had so long patiently borne,—the patronising wardship of her brother and the overbearing insolence of Elizabeth. During the pursuit of her brother in the face of a violent storm of wind and rain, “although the most part waxed weary, yet the queen’s courage,” Knox tells us, “increased manlike, so that she was ever with the foremost.” But her courage was also womanly,—eager, passionate, vehement, and apt to be rash and blind. Still the admiring homage it evoked counter-balanced, for the time being, the bad impression produced by the defects of Darnley, though he was soon to prove a sore handicap for her. The coming tragedy of their relations had already begun to cast its shadow on her path, though at first she seems to have been too absorbed in her purpose to have any misgivings. Consciously or not, she was utilising him mainly as a means to her own ends, and, if gradually becoming less assured of his fitness for his position, she had now no option but to proceed with her great adventure to its final issue.

CHAPTER VI.

MARY.—FROM THE DARNLEY MARRIAGE UNTIL
HER EXECUTION.

To anticipate the hostilities of her brother, Mary hastened the marriage, which took place at Holyrood Chapel on 29th July 1565. Roman rites were observed; but the king, instead of attending the subsequent mass, "went to his pastime." Mary found it impossible to await the arrival of the Papal dispensation, needful in the case of cousins. Though the Cardinal of Lorraine had promised to procure it, he had made no secret of his disapproval of the marriage: its arrival had been unduly delayed; even the postponement of the marriage might be little short of a catastrophe; and she resolved to take the possible risk of acting without the sanction of Rome.

Meantime, much boded well for her. Moray and his supporters were in a great minority. Besides Châtelherault and Argyll, his chief allies were the Earls of Glencairn and Rothes, Lords Boyd and Ochiltree (father-in-law of Knox), and Kirkcaldy of Grange, representing mainly the enemies of Lennox and the extreme Protestants. Elizabeth's chicanery and dictatorial airs had done much to turn the tide in Mary's favour; Lady Lennox, also, had secured the support of Morton, the head of the Douglasses, as guardian of

the young Earl of Angus; and the claims both of Mary and Darnley on the devotion of the Stewarts were superior to those of the "bastard." The kin connection of Darnley—as both a Stewart and a Douglas—brought him the support of Lords Lindsay and Ruthven; and further, though Lady Lennox had strong Catholic leanings, Darnley and his father were nominally Protestants. Finally Mary let slip two nobles who, in the pursuit of her brother, would be as eager and ruthless as bloodhounds. The one was young Huntly, a prisoner in Dunbar, whose father's house Moray had brought to ruin; the other was Bothwell, who, driven into exile by Moray, had sworn to make *him* die in exile.

Against such a varied and powerful opposition, headed by the lawful sovereign, Moray, with the loudest thunders of Knox to back him, was merely impotent, without more substantial aid from Elizabeth than surreptitious gifts of money; and while the reinforcements he hoped for at Edinburgh—to which he made a rapid march from Ayr—failed to come in, no signs appeared of the English ships which, it was hoped, would land a force at Leith. Then Mar, instead of rendering to him the castle, actually began firing on him; and learning that the queen was hastening from the west with a powerful force, he barely saved himself by a rapid retreat towards Dumfries.

Elizabeth now sought to intervene on his behalf, but Mary would have nothing but unconditional surrender. As for the English succours, Elizabeth made mere mockery of Moray's just and ardent expectations. She had fondly hoped that he would have given his sister much more trouble; she had been itching to send him help; but though the spirit was willing, in the end prudence prevailed. His supplications she met with the truism that to grant him her aid would mean

“open war”; but should he fail to obtain terms from his sister, she offered, “out of her private love and clemency,” to give him and the confederate lords shelter in England. When Mary—ignorant of Elizabeth’s recreancy, but resolved rather to lose her crown than not be revenged on her brother—marched towards the Borders with 18,000 men, he had therefore no option but to disband his forces and accept Elizabeth’s hospitality.

Well might Bedford describe the unhappy Moray as “sorely perplexed, poor gentleman.” Nor could his perplexity have been lessened by Elizabeth’s rating of him before the French ambassador. That the rating was merely comedy was but cold comfort; he himself as well as Elizabeth must have greatly sunk in his estimation; for never, surely, had one of such portentous prudence been so sorely duped. If deceived and wronged by his sister, he had been treated still more wantonly by Elizabeth; and by the two together he had been brought to ruin.

Yet Elizabeth had cut a more contemptible figure than her gull. He had shown decision and fortitude; she merely deceit and angry impotence. While more than willing to offend, she had been preposterously afraid to strike. For the time being she had thus confirmed rather than shaken Mary’s position in Scotland. Mary’s triumph, to outward appearance, was a great and signal one. She had married the husband of her choice; she had defied and discredited Elizabeth; she had driven her brother out of Scotland; Châtelherault was an exile in France; Argyll had fled to his Highland fastnesses; the other lords were with Moray in England; and the more extreme Protestants were in a condition of collapse.

But what of the future? How was she to utilise her triumph? She had undertaken the government of

turbulent and distracted Scotland. Was she equal to the task? She had taken her fate into her own hands. Had she wisdom and power to dispose of it aright? By no means. She was a helpless derelict on a raft drifting towards the rocks. With her difficulties and perils she was quite unfit to cope. She was too impulsive, too impatient, too narrowly and short-sightedly self-devoted; and her upbringing and religion predisposed her to an erroneous policy. She had become in spirit an alien; and being now brought, at last, into acute antagonism with Elizabeth and Protestantism, she was tempted, recklessly and impetuously, to set about the immediate attainment of her uttermost ambitions. From her letter to the Pope, 31st January 1565-6, we learn that she thought the time opportune for the restoration of Catholicism, because "her enemies were in exile or in her power." The temptation might be great, but it led her far astray as to possibilities; and her method of setting to work gave her no chance of success. She was now, therefore, swiftly nearing the disasters towards which her whole past had been so singularly co-operating, and to which future circumstances were to conduce with a dreadful opportuneness.

The first symptoms of calamity appeared in her relations with Darnley. Disillusionment had quickly followed her marriage. She had been fervently eager for the wedding; and their common danger had evoked a stronger mutual sympathy than otherwise might have been possible. She did everything to emphasise her respect for him, conferring on him the royal historic Dukedom of Albany and honouring him with the title of king. But after the triumph over Moray came the reaction; and when her enthusiasm had time to cool, she discovered, to her acute distress, that her husband was by no means a helpmeet for her. Within five months of the marriage, Randolph gratified Elizabeth

by reporting that instead of the appellations, "King and Queen, his Majesty and hers," the "Queen's husband" was now the common style, and that coins with *Hen. et Maria* had been called in for others in which Mary had precedence. Mary had thus decided not to grant him the crown matrimonial, which, if it did not mean direct hostility or aversion to him, implied a great lack of confidence in his discretion.

This in itself was deplorable enough, but what, in her present perilous position, might it not forebode? Her decision, necessarily unpleasant to him, might even be reckoned a dire injustice. His near heirship both to the English and Scottish crowns was being practically ignored. Mary, owing to his place in the succession, was advantaged by the marriage hardly less than he; and the bargain became one-sided when he was treated as a political nonentity. Yet her decision was evidently fully warranted: it was at once her justification and her misfortune to have no other option. In itself this was a sufficiently bad and tragic necessity; but the characteristics of Darnley that made it inevitable greatly aggravated its consequences; and if anything had been needed to make them fatal, it was the contrast between her treatment of him and the favours she was heaping on the Italian secretary, Riccio.

Here also Mary might, from her own point of view, plead necessity. The great rise in Riccio's fortunes was, by her enemies, attributed to her passion for him; but there is no convincing proof of this, while there can be no doubt of his political value to her. From the time that she broke with Moray she ceased to trust Maitland, and she was now contemplating schemes in which Maitland could have neither lot nor part. Yet we have but to consider the fate of Cochrane, the favourite of James III., to recognise the enormity of her mistake. If Riccio was essential for her scheme,

then it had no chance of success. Apart from the Darnley difficulty, he was certain to be speedily struck down; but the Darnley difficulty made this enormous difference: had he been struck down without Darnley appearing as avenger, Darnley would not have given her the dire offence which made reconciliation with him impossible.

Apart from a ridiculous story of de Foix, there is nothing to show that Darnley had adequate grounds for his suspicions; and however that may be, he was merely the dupe of conspirators who were bent on utilising him for a purpose of their own. While feeding his jealousy, they promised him the crown matrimonial. But his amatory or political wrongs were nothing to them. They were concerned only for the return of the exiled lords and the renewal of the Protestant ascendancy. Riccio's murder on the threshold of the queen's chamber was either done to implicate Darnley, or due to overpowering passion. Morton and Ruthven asserted that it was at Darnley's request he was taken "at supper time, sitting with her majesty at table, that she might be taunted in his presence, because she had not entertained her husband according to her accustomed manner as she ought of duty"; but the device looks like a suggestion of the conspirators.

The conspiracy, shared in by the rebel lords in England, previously the sworn enemies of Darnley, was hallowed by a band,—for all that it contained a comparatively innocent and, it might well seem, most praiseworthy band: one for securing to Darnley what might be deemed his just right, the crown matrimonial and succession to the throne failing issue to the queen; this on condition that he obtained remission for the rebel lords and restoration to their lands, supported the Reformed religion, and maintained them as a good master should.

Ostensibly it was formed in the interests of a general pacification : between the queen and Darnley ; between him and the rebel lords, who now not only agreed to support him, but to grant him his heart's desire ; and between them and the queen, whose marriage to Darnley they agreed to support with almost burning fervour. Yet the band was a mere ordinance of rebellion ; it implied support to Darnley in any action against the queen's official, Riccio ; and its ulterior aim was to enable the Protestant lords to utilise Darnley in such a way that she would be entirely in their power.

After the murder of Riccio the conspirators continued to hold possession of the palace and to detain the queen in her rooms until Moray's arrival from England. He now listened to his sister's tale of woe with deep manifestations of sympathetic sorrow ; and she apparently credited him with as much good feeling as would have prevented the disgraceful scene in the supper-room and on its threshold. Still, although the deed was "foully done," Moray could hardly pretend that the "loon" was not "weel away." And since he was away, the theory of Moray and his friends, the assassins, was that bygones should be bygones. The queen, when her feelings had time to calm, showed also an inclination to come to terms with them. She even offered to put all things in oblivion, and asked the lords to draw up acts of security that she might subscribe them. To the sincerity of her sentiments she gave also remarkable testimony : taking Moray by the one hand and Darnley by the other, she walked with them in the outer court for more than an hour—surely an amazing enough instance of Christian charity !

Betrayal, however, was the main thought of all the three now, outwardly, so blessedly reconciled ; but, in the first instance, success was with the queen against

Moray and his associates. To obtain her signature they found it needful to humour her by vacating the palace during the night. They thought to serve their purpose sufficiently by leaving her in charge of Darnley ; but with him she had no difficulty. It was easy to persuade him of what was the fact, that they had merely been making their own use of him ; and to their utter discomfiture she made a midnight flight with him to Dunbar. Besides escaping from their clutches she, by spiriting him away, deprived them of the means of usurping her authority ; and, now on her side against them, he confessed that he had been abused by them, who had induced him to take action against Riccio.

The support of Mary from Bothwell, Huntly, and others was, in itself, formidable ; and, besides, since Riccio was dead and Darnley was reconciled to her, the conspirators had no case against her. When, therefore, she offered a full pardon to the exiled lords, and resolved to put to the horn only those concerned in Riccio's assassination, they ruefully agreed amongst themselves to accept the compromise. Morton, Ruthven, and others, supporters of Darnley's marriage and assassins of Riccio, fled to England, and Moray and other rebels against the marriage became reconciled to the queen. As before, the Protestant party was weakened ; but although the heads of one section were in exile, the two sections were now reconciled : both were now mortal enemies of Darnley and in veiled hostility to the queen.

Thus though, as before, the queen had triumphed, her present triumph was even more equivocal than her previous one ; her position was much more precarious, her prospects much meaner and more doubtful than they had ever been. The death of Riccio, the sudden ruin of her plans for a Catholic conquest of England, the partial clouding of her good name by, probably, un-

just scandal,—all this was painful enough; but the most direful and distressing aspect of her situation—that which killed her political hopes and robbed her anticipations of all their alluring fragrance—was the loathly burden of Darnley. He poisoned all her pleasure, he darkened and menaced all her future.

Meantime she had to conceal her nausea and make a show of being reconciled to him; this for her reputation's sake and the protection from reproach of her expected child. In notorious disregard of facts, he was therefore, at the Market Cross of Edinburgh, declared to be innocent of the conspiracy against Riccio and the queen, his only offence being his assent to the return of the English lords. But already Bothwell had become to him as great a stumbling-block as Riccio had been. Badly assorted as he and Mary were, their new circumstances were quite admirably fitted to develop their antipathies. Less than ever could she give her confidence to him or admit him to the crown matrimonial; and her main reliance against the Protestant lords was Bothwell. So exasperated, therefore, did Darnley become, that he even sought to induce Argyll and Moray, whom he had but lately betrayed, to join him in a conspiracy against Bothwell. But his failure with them robbed him largely of his self-confidence, and possibly made him readier to comply with the queen's request that he should be present in Edinburgh Castle at the birth of their child.

The birth of Prince James, 19th June 1566, might well be reckoned by the queen almost the only fortunate event that had befallen her since her arrival in Scotland. While it added to her claims to recognition as Elizabeth's successor, it tended to warm to her the hearts of the Scottish patriots, who proudly anticipated his succession to the English throne. But though their hopes were to be amply fulfilled, here

as elsewhere the queen's seeming good fortune was to be transformed into calamity, her pleasure and pride into gall and wormwood.

With her recovery, the queen became fertile in expedients to avoid Darnley's company. At what time her aversion became conjoined with a passion for Bothwell is not definitely known, apart from assertions which may be mere calumnies; but her ride in October to the Hermitage, where Bothwell lay wounded, seems to have been prompted by a warmer sentiment than platonic friendship. In any case, the final strength of her passion for him does not admit of doubt. If there never was more than make-believe in her partiality for Darnley, there was nothing feigned in her preference for Bothwell. In both cases there was a kind of political necessity; but if in the former case it was ambition that prevailed, in the latter it was passion. In which case she made the more egregious mistake, 'twere hard to say, though the earlier may be deemed the original fountain of her misfortunes. But the latter mistake was quite as easy to make as the former one. Bothwell was notoriously successful with women. Most likely he was passionately loved both by the Norwegian, Anne Thorrsen, and his wife, Lady Jean Gordon. His daring as well as his loyal devotion to herself, specially commended him to Mary; and his wild and reckless inclinations were combined with some veneer of culture, while they had a common topic of interest in their French experiences. Moreover, he had become to her a political necessity, just as Darnley had been and after him Riccio; and her case was now more urgent, for there was now this sad difference, that she was now the victim less of hope than of despair.

But the scandalous thing, it may be said, is that both were married. A few weeks before the Riccio murder the queen had brought about the marriage of Both-

well to Lady Jean Gordon, daughter of the dead and forfeited Huntly; but such was the unexpected turn of events, that she was now beginning to covet the husband of Lady Jean. The lack of consideration for Lady Jean adds to the scandal of the complicated case. Still, notwithstanding the sacrosanct character, in Catholic eyes, of the marriage tie, it was, especially as regards exalted personages, an age of divorces, of divorces that were conventionally reputable; and to oblige the sovereign in such a matter might be reckoned a kind of privilege.

But however that may be, it was not here that the main difficulty lay, nor from this that the tragedy developed. The outstanding obstacle was Darnley. The mere political objection to divorce from him was lessened by the birth of the prince, whose rights could be technically guarded. Still the child might die, and danger to Mary's English claims, as well as to those of subsequent children, might occur from the divorced husband who might marry again,—marry one of the possible claimants to the English throne. But probably this aspect of the case did not trouble Mary. Driven by political necessity to seek the protection of Bothwell, she was now absorbed in her passion for him, and to accomplish marriage to him was prepared to "spare neither honour, conscience, hazard, nor greatness whatsoever." The main, the insuperable, difficulty was that Darnley himself would object; and the Papal authorities would, it was to be feared, be on his side. What expedient remained? Nothing but his removal by death,—either legally, or through a fray or quarrel, or by poison or assassination. He had been threatening to leave the country, and it would have been well for him to have done so speedily and without word spoken. An understanding that boded no good to him had been arrived at between the Protestant lords

on the one hand and Mary and Bothwell on the other; and the exiled lords whom he had betrayed were about to return to Scotland. This meant that, somehow or other, the queen's difficulty would be solved. If the first scheme mooted was a trial for treason, the inconvenience of this was soon evident; and from the expedient of a fray he was probably saved by his resolve to keep his room at Stirling at the time of the prince's baptism, by his sudden departure thereafter to his father at Glasgow and by his illness there. While he was at Glasgow, Bothwell vainly sought to induce the recalled Morton to arrange for getting rid of him, as in the case of Riccio. The affair being therefore mainly that of the queen and Bothwell, and Bothwell being the man he was, he felt constrained himself to arrange for the murder; and it was effected with a sensational audacity that did more than credit to his repute as a desperado.

For the queen it may be pleaded that Darnley had mortally offended her, and that legally his offence warranted his death, the only difficulty being how to effect it legally. She was thus tempted to involve herself in a technical criminality, which assumed a more flagitious aspect from her relations with Bothwell. But she was more the victim of both men than either was of her. Each of them, after his own fashion—the one as despicable fool, the other as foolhardy villain—was so unique, and her circumstances were so difficult, that between them she had scarce a chance of escape. She could hardly have married a husband more admirably unfit for his position than Darnley; and placed by him in almost intolerable embarrassment and trouble, she was driven to have recourse to friendship with one who was certain to bring upon her more bitter affliction.

The character both of her responsibility and that of

Bothwell for the murder is pungently revealed in what are known as the Casket Letters. Though we possess none of Bothwell's communications to the queen, her letters, written under the stress of strong and complex emotion, while vividly disclosing her attitude to the murder, indirectly threw much light on his. While he "took the deed in hand," he determined that she should co-operate with him in bringing it about. On her part, again, there is evidence of so absorbing a passion for him, or so extreme an anxiety to become his wife, as to compel her, though not without acute mortification and distress, to do his ruthless behests. She manifests neither callousness nor faint-heartedness, but the poignant anguish of a woman of dauntless courage and proud self-esteem in being compelled to undertake a task extremely hateful to her better instincts. "You make me," so she writes, "dissemble so much that I am afraid with horror, and you make me almost play the part of a traitor. Remember that if it were not for obliging you I would rather be dead." Yet her scruples were less about the murder than the part she had to play as a decoy. Her own "particular revenge" might well dispose her to seek his death, but merely for revenge she would have scorned to stoop to the flattery and beguilement she was now using to lure him to his doom. It was for Bothwell's sake she consented to this. "Alas," she wrote, "I never deceived anybody, but I remit myself to your will, and send me word what I shall do, and whatever may happen to me I will obey you."

The midnight explosion at Kirk-o'-Field on 9th February 1566-7, followed by the discovery of Darnley's dead body, necessarily caused a strange astonishment; but there was a profound conviction that Bothwell was primarily responsible for the tragedy, and that the queen was art and part with him. Unhappily, also,

she had virulent enemies, who, since her arrival in Scotland, had been hoping for her fall. Clearly it was not sorrow for Darnley, but sheer ill-will to her that moved her and Darnley's enemies, the preachers, to supplicate the Most High that he would "reveal and revenge." But the fervent passion of the preachers was not shared by the lords. They showed no eager desire for a solution of the mystery. "Discreet persons," observed the pious and prudent Moray, "will not rashly judge in so horrible crimes." His own disinclination rashly to judge he showed by leaving Scotland two days before the trial of Bothwell for the murder; and on account of the averseness of the lords to do so, Bothwell, though definitely accused by Lennox of the murder, was, because of the absence of Lennox, and on other technical grounds that will not bear examination, pronounced "not guilty."

In their difficult dilemma Mary and Bothwell now chose the more dangerous part. But they were not thinking of danger; they were merely determined—and, perhaps, she more than Bothwell—to enjoy the full fruition of their achievement; and they set about this with a reckless disregard of the conventional decencies that immensely deepened the sinister shadows with which they were already enveloped. Prudently, if brazenly, Bothwell adopted the precaution of obtaining from the principal lords a band that they would set forward the marriage with their "counsel, satisfaction, and assistance"; but even before they signed it, he was intending to disregard its letter by ostensibly carrying off the queen captive to Dunbar. On the very day after the signature in Ainslie's tavern, she set out to visit her child in Stirling Castle, on the understanding that he would waylay her as she was returning.

There was some delay on Bothwell's part in complet-

ing the arrangement for the mock seizure, and from the queen's letters to him we learn that Huntly had sought to advise her against the "foolish enterprise," representing, among other things, "that the lords would unsay themselves and deny that they had said." The good sense of this is patent enough; but almost the only anxiety of the queen was lest there should be a slip betwixt the cup and the lip. Her solicitude was also fanned by distrust of the Gordons. They and the Douglasses were, in her opinion, "two false races." She had, in fact, given the Gordons good cause to hate her, even apart from the immense sacrifice she was demanding of Lady Jean. Distrusting, therefore, even the motive of Huntly's advice, she informed him that unless Bothwell, by his own will, withdrew, no persuasion, nor death itself, would make her fail him.

With sublime audacity the mock abduction was therefore, on 24th April 1567, carried out; and on 3rd May Lady Jean, for certain reasons, obtained a civil divorce from her husband; while, on 7th May, a Catholic commission pronounced the marriage to have been, from lack of a dispensation, invalid from the beginning. On the previous day the abductor and the abducted arrived under salvos of artillery in Edinburgh Castle, and on the 15th the marriage was celebrated after the Protestant fashion in the great hall of Holyrood. On the 22nd a proclamation was also issued declaring the revocation of any writing "for permitting any persons to use the old form of religion, because she intended inviolably to maintain the Act published concerning religion upon her first arrival from France." Nevertheless, she instructed the Bishop of Dunblane to announce to the King of France and her other French friends that she did not intend "to leave her religion" for Bothwell "or any man on earth."

But the Protestant marriage as well as the proclama-

tion implied in Mary a resilement from her old Catholic aspirations, and even a submission to her husband's guidance in matters of State. She had denied to Darnley the crown matrimonial; to his successor she resigned the chief management of her affairs, and she may well have done so with a feeling of relief, so utterly had she failed in her attempt to govern Scotland, and so baulked had she been in her chief ambitions. Doubtless, also, a Protestant policy was counted on to reconcile the Protestants to the marriage. Enjoying, as they supposed they did, the goodwill of many Protestant lords, they might flatter themselves that the merely preliminary irregularities to their joint rule would be condoned and in the end forgotten. Unhappily they failed to realise the extraordinary sensation produced by their astounding proceedings. Even had the lords wished they could not, in face of the extreme hostility aroused by the abduction feat, have continued their support to Bothwell; and, as Huntly anticipated, they made no account whatever of their band with him. He had broken with them, not they with him, and it was ostensibly against him and in defence of the queen that they now took up arms. Their avowed purpose was to deliver her from him, to preserve the life of the prince, and to pursue the murderers of the king.

By their method of effecting the marriage, Mary and Bothwell had merely filled to the brim the cup of distrust and indignation against them. They had made themselves impossible. This was swiftly and irrevocably confirmed at Carberry Hill, when, on 15th June, the last day of their honeymoon, they were compelled to part from each other for ever. For whatever reason, the Hamiltons failed to keep their tryst with them; and while this succour was awaited in vain, their followers began to disperse so rapidly that they

had no option but to come to terms with the insurgents. For their own sakes, certain confederate lords were disposed to do Bothwell the best service now possible, and the queen having agreed to place herself under their protection, he was permitted to ride off unmolested.

Imperative as was Bothwell's flight, the queen parted from him with painful reluctance, though her uppermost sentiments were evidently resentment rather than dismay. Her undaunted, and even angry, bearing probably did not a little to evoke against her the rabid fury of the insurgents. That rabid fury, those who deprecated it were quite powerless to restrain. Transformed the most of them into a mere fanatical mob, they greeted her as she approached them with cries of "Burn the whore! Burn the murderess of her husband." Then placing before her their banner—originally meant primarily against Bothwell—in which Darnley was shown lying dead under a tree, and the infant prince, her son, near him with uplifted hands crying for vengeance, they escorted her with their brutal cries towards Edinburgh, whilst she met their revilings with indignant protestations, and "burst forth in tears, threats, and reproaches as her discontent moved."

Without hesitation the multitude would have burned her in front of the provost's house in the High Street, where, dishevelled and wildly hysterical, she was to be lodged for the night; some even of the lords were for her instant trial, with a view to her execution; but, after being escorted on the evening of next day to Holyrood under a strong guard, she was during the night conveyed to the island keep of Lochleven, belonging to Sir William Douglas, half-brother of Moray, the mother of both being in charge of the keep.

Then happened what to some of the lords must have

seemed a great piece of good fortune, and to Mary one of the sorest strokes of ill-luck amongst the crowd of mischances that had befallen her since her arrival in Scotland. This was the discovery, on 24th June, in a garret of the Potterrow—where a messenger of Bothwell had taken refuge—of the silver casket containing letters from her to Bothwell and other incriminating documents. Possessed of these papers, the lords had her, as well as Bothwell, at their mercy. Her detention could now be fully justified. The lords could, and did, immediately use them to disarm the hostility of the French king and her French relatives; and they more especially damaged her reputation with the Catholics, which had already been so impaired that the Pope had intimated to her that “he would not hold further communication with her, unless in time to come she showed better signs of her life and religion than she had in the past.”

But their chief convenience to the lords was in dealing with the queen. Her pride, or passion, or generosity, or situation would not permit her to separate her case from Bothwell's; but, dreading a public trial, or a summary execution, that might be justified by the exhibition of the letters, she consented, on 29th July, to sign an act of demission in favour of her infant son, who the same day was crowned king in the parish church of Stirling. There was thus inaugurated a Protestant regency under the auspices of Moray, who, on learning of the discovery of the documents, returned, full of decorous amazement and regret, to Scotland; and, after an agitated and variegated interview with his sister, induced her to coincide in his acceptance of the regency as a special favour to herself.

The causes of Mary's overthrow were manifold: religion, ambition, passion, each in turn or in associa-

tion played a part in bringing it about ; and her avowed friends, as well as her open enemies, contributed to her undoing. Had she renounced Catholicism all might have been well with her ; had she thrown away her darling ambitions she might have avoided the path of ruin ; had she not married Darnley, other false steps might have been avoided ; and but for her passion for Bothwell she might have escaped her worst woes ; but these various alternatives were so difficult of acceptance as hardly to place her salvation within the sphere of bare possibility. From the beginning events co-operated against her with such unbroken uniformity that her case seems rather one of predetermined tragedy than responsible and culpable shortcoming.

Protesting against her dethronement, Elizabeth now proposed to act as umpire, or rather judge, between her and her subjects ; but when this offer was ignored she made no attempt to succour her. Nor was there, meanwhile, any party in Scotland anxious for her reinstatement on the throne. She had disappointed the Catholics even more than she had offended the Protestants ; them she had benefited more than she had offended. While she had left Catholicism in the lurch, she had rendered, against her desire, much service to Protestantism, which, now delivered from the anxiety of her uncertain and menacing policy, had the protection of a Protestant regency, with the ultimate prospect of a Protestant king.

To Mary herself her case never, until almost the last, appeared to be hopeless ; but her escape from Lochleven, 2nd May 1568, could have proved of advantage to her only had she reached the Continent ; and this her main supporters, the Hamiltons, by no means desired. They were aiding her mainly for their own sakes ; they wished to detain her under their own protection with a view to her marriage to Lord John

Hamilton. Failing, after the defeat at Langside, to reach Dumbarton with a view to embarkation for France, she fled south to England; but if this saved her from the Hamiltons, whom she did not trust, and from recapture and possible execution, it delivered her into the hands of an altogether implacable enemy. Elizabeth would neither aid her nor permit her, as she had hoped, to pass to France, or indeed out of England. She proposed to inquire into her rights and wrongs, but this in opposition to her protests. That she was able to assume this high-handed attitude was due to the previous hostility of Mary, her recent loss of credit at home and abroad, the internal difficulties of France, the jealousy between France and Spain, and the supineness of Philip II.

The advantage of having control over Mary was, however, almost counterbalanced by the provocation of her mortal enmity and the transfer of her machinations directly to England. Meantime the fall of Edinburgh Castle, 29th May 1573, filled Mary's friends with despair; and while she was busy in her captivity with plots and schemes for the recovery of her sovereignty, her cause in Scotland had become more hopeless than ever.

The first effort on Mary's behalf was a project of Maitland for her marriage to the Duke of Norfolk. Norfolk being a Protestant, it was hoped that the proposal would commend itself even to Elizabeth. But it was a rather desperate device, and it merely incited Elizabeth to discredit Mary by causing the Scottish commissioners to exhibit the casket documents at the Westminster conference. This made the Norfolk scheme assume a new character. While it was still supported by the Protestants, in order to reconcile the two queens, the Catholic nobles, by representing the hopelessness of this, induced Norfolk to sanction a

conspiracy against Elizabeth. The plot was for the time frustrated by the arrest of Norfolk, who, on 8th October 1569, was sent to the Tower, but on obtaining his liberty in August 1570 he was prevailed on to sanction the despatch of the Florentine, Ridolfi, to mature a scheme for Spanish aid on behalf of an English insurrection. This was frustrated by the discovery, in April 1571, of secret despatches in possession of Charles Baillie, secretary of Leslie, Bishop of Ross, and after the exposure of the conspiracy Norfolk, on 2nd June, was executed at Tower Hill.

Meantime was concluded at Blois, 29th April, a defensive league between Elizabeth and Charles IX. of France; but that king's death, in May 1575, and the succession of Henry III., a special friend of the Guises, slightly improved Mary's position. France might not have interfered with the design of Don Juan, the victor of Lepanto, to make an attempt on England from the Netherlands and become joint ruler with Mary of a Catholic Britain; but this grandiose purpose was put an end to by his death, 10th October 1578.

If the monotony of Mary's imprisonment was constantly relieved by the excitement of conspiracies, there was a sad sameness in the constant and speedy shattering of her reviving hopes. Much attention was given by her to a project for spiriting her son out of the country, which would have done both her and her son ill rather than good; but there never was the faintest chance of its possibility. While, also, the execution, 2nd June 1581, of Morton, her "greatest enemy," seemed to make possible a cordial understanding between her and her son, it only revealed that her son was merely destitute of filial feelings towards her. He declined to consider her proposal for a joint sovereignty, with his present retention of the throne as her *locum tenens*; an elaborate scheme for his sub-

mission to the Catholic Church and his sanction of a Catholic rising on her behalf proved merely chimerical; and in the end, through the treachery of the Master of Gray, a treaty was negotiated between her son and Elizabeth without mention of her.

Her son's practical desertion of her cause was an overwhelming blow to her hopes of liberty; and his lack of filial affection added to her disappointment a pang of such bitterness that she formally disinherited him. The evident ruthlessness of Elizabeth begat also a similar feeling on her part; and she was stung to desperation by the elaborate precautions now taken by her keeper, Sir Amyas Paulet, for her safety, by seeking to debar her from all communication with the outside world. Ardent and passionate as she was, it thus became a sheer impossibility for her to avoid the temptation of utilising the opportunity, cunningly provided by Elizabeth's agents, for involving herself in the plot known as "the Babington Conspiracy." Less discredit attaches to her despairing approval of it than to Elizabeth's agents in laying the snare for her.

Owing to the possible peril to English Protestantism should Mary survive Elizabeth, Elizabeth's advisers may well have been more anxious for Mary's execution than Elizabeth herself was; and this may so far excuse Elizabeth's mean subterfuges to avoid the odium of it. Still, amid much uniquely equivocal in her royal procedure, probably the most unique and the least admirable of her equivocations was that by which she sought to free herself from responsibility for depriving her sister sovereign of her life.

Of Mary's trial the outstanding features were her own dauntless bearing and her clever defence, and the relentless character of the prosecution. Even spotless innocence would hardly have availed her with such a prosecution and tribunal, for the trial was merely the medium to

give legal colouring to an execution deemed necessary apart from her innocence or guilt. But if her death might well, from the Protestant standpoint, be deemed a necessity, the refusal to her of the right publicly to die in Protestant England as a Catholic was surely far from obligatory. The deplorable effort to make her submit on the scaffold to a Protestant ceremonial merely tended to confirm the contention of the Catholics that her Catholicism was her main crime, and to confer on her death the aspect of heroic martyrdom.

But however dearly she had, in the end, to pay for her Catholicism, she had never shown much of the single-hearted devotion, the sublimely unselfish, if narrow, faith of the religious devotee. She had largely subordinated her Catholicism to her own personal interests; and, in the end, her errors of conduct inflicted on it in Scotland almost irreparable evil. Still, apart from her Catholicism, she might have been a quite successful ruler. It was the religious difficulty that brought her faults and weaknesses, both as woman and sovereign, into prominence, and armed them with the power to effect her ruin. Manifest enough as were her shortcomings, they dwindle into insignificance in comparison with the potency of the external agencies, which, from the beginning to the end, shaped out her fortunes with a nice adjustment of means to ends almost appalling in their relentlessness. Except indirectly, she exerted absolutely no influence on the events of her time. Her great projects brought her merely disappointment and misery. From first to last her sovereignty was a failure, or rather it had practically no existence; but since she nominally held that office, the character of her career had much to do with the confirmation of Protestantism in Britain, and especially with the peculiar dominance of the Kirk in Scotland, and the subsequent contest for supremacy between the

Kirk and the sovereigns, and the ecclesiastical and civil authorities.

Mary was executed at Fotheringay, 8th February 1586-7, and on 7th August she was buried in Peterborough Cathedral; but after his accession to the English throne, James transferred the body to Henry VIII.'s chapel in Westminster Abbey, where he erected a monument with recumbent effigy to her memory.

Mary's letters are notable for their vigorous and strenuous tone, whether in the expression of love or hate, sorrow or joy. Feeling strongly and keenly, she was, when greatly moved, tersely and vividly eloquent. But a religious meditation, preserved in the Record Office, and an essay on Government in the Cottonian Library, are both rather trite and tame. Three poetical pieces of some merit have been attributed to her erroneously: the verses on the death of her husband, Francis II., printed by Brantôme in his *Mémoires* and frequently reprinted, have lately been proved to be Brantôme's; the lines, *Adieu, plaisant pays de France*, published as hers by de Querlon in 1765, are now known to be by de Querlon; and there is no evidence for attributing to her a Latin hymn, *O! Dominus Deus, Speravi in Te*. Besides the sonnets to Bothwell, other verses known to be hers are a sonnet to Elizabeth in Italian and French in the Cottonian Library, first printed in Malcolm Laing's *History of Scotland*, ii. 220-1; *Meditation fait par la Reyn d'Escosse Dovarière de France*, published in 1574 by Bishop Leslie, along with a shorter poem which he asserted she had written, in *Afflicti Animi Consolationes*, &c., reprinted in *Lettres et Traitez Chrestiens*, by David Home, at Bergerac in 1613, and in *The Bannatyne Miscellany*, i. 343-7; a sonnet, written at Fotheringay, in the State Paper Office; and two short poems in the Bodleian. Bishop Montague, in his preface to the *Works of King James*, 1616,

mentions, as in the possession of the king, a book of verses in French of the *Institution of a Prince*, written in her own hand, and the cover of it wrought with her needle; and in the catalogue of books presented to Edinburgh University, there appears under her name, *Tetrasticha ou Quatrains a son fils*, MS., but the volume has disappeared. Some verses by her on her *Books of Hours* are printed by Labanoff, *Lettres*, vii. 346-52.

CHAPTER VII.

JAMES VI. AND I.—AS SCOTTISH SOVEREIGN.

THE rejoicings at the birth of James VI. in Edinburgh, 19th June 1566, and those on the occasion of his baptism at Stirling, 19th September, must, in the case of the court, have been rather overclouded with anxiety. The queen especially was far from happy and contented. Still, none could have dreamed that within a year of the birth she was to be a prisoner in Lochleven, and that in less than five weeks more her infant son was, 29th July 1567, through her compulsory demission of her crown in his favour, to be crowned king in the parish church of Stirling. To have thrust on him a premature sovereignty through his father's murder and his mother's disgrace, was hardly an enviable destiny for the child. On the death of his grandfather, the Regent Lennox, shot by the Hamiltons at Stirling in September 1571, he was also left without the protection of any near relatives; and the party in whose hands he was placed were interested in his welfare mainly from ecclesiastical motives, and bent on exploiting him for their own purposes.

That party, however, according to their lights, did their best to train the boy to become an efficient king. His governors and tutors were at least honourable and well-meaning. Alexander Erskine, who on the death

of Mar in 1572 became his governor in Stirling Castle, is described as "a nobleman of true gentle nature"; and Lady Mar, who remained in charge of the household, secured the boy's respectful affection. That George Buchanan, the vituperative reviler of his mother, should become his principal tutor, was hardly an ideal arrangement; but Buchanan, a dependent of Lennox, was a scholar of European repute. Randolph, the English ambassador, even expressed the opinion that James was more happy to have had him for his master "than Alexander, who had Aristotle." Ultimately, the admiration of James for his tutor was not quite unqualified. He was not disposed to accept him as an authority either on Scottish history or on statesmanship. How far he was sincere in denouncing his and Knox's versions of his mother's story as "infamous invective" may be open to question; but he was evidently quite persuaded of the pestilential character of his notions as to the prerogatives of the people. Still, he made excuse for the "humour and heat" of his spirit as political historian, and deemed it not the least of his own many causes for self-congratulation and pride that he had been the pupil of so great a scholar and poet.

Under Buchanan, much of the drudgery of the king's instruction fell to the subordinate tutor, Mr Peter Young, a pupil of Beza. Probably it was to Young that James owed his theological bent; and Young was more successful in indoctrinating him with Protestantism than Buchanan in lessening his regard for his royal rights. But even as to Protestantism, James had a mind of his own. He did not become a Protestant quite after the Kirk's own heart, for while a contemner of the Pope and the Mass, he in the end was as hostile to Presbytery as to Papacy. In other respects he was a model pupil; not only diligent and obedient, but exceedingly precocious. The clergyman,

James Melville, deemed him, in 1574, quite a marvel of youthful learning and wisdom: "the sweetest sight in Europe that day for ingyne, judgment, memory, and language. I heard him discourse, walking up and down in the auld Lady Mar's hand, of knowledge and ignorance, to my great marvel and astonishment." The English Killigrew supplies, also, details: "The boy," he reports, "not only spoke the French tongue marvellous well, but was able, *extempore*, to read a chapter of the Bible out of Latin into French, and out of French into English, so that few could have bettered the translation." Later, he seems to have been instructed by Alexander Montgomerie in the metrical art of the Scottish poets, and like various of his predecessors on the throne he essayed verse, which, if a little lacking in inspiration, shows considerable mastery of form and some rhetorical felicity. But, on the whole, like many infant prodigies, he failed to fulfil the promise of his early years. If he possessed a marked individuality, it was not that of an exceptional genius, either as scholar, thinker, or ruler. If in the events of his time he was an intrusive and meddlesome, he was hardly a commanding, personality. He was more the slave than the master of his learning; a pedantic theorist rather than a thinker; oddly clever rather than able; an ingeniously fantastic, political tactician rather than a skilful statesman.

In his home on the rock the infant sovereign was, as his mother had been, a centre of attraction to many intriguers. The nobles, the Protestant clergy, the Catholics, Elizabeth, his mother, France and Spain,—all had their own ends to serve by him. Of his mother he was both the bugbear and the hope. After the death of Lennox, she sent him a letter and a present of ponies; but they were not allowed to reach him. Morton's regency was an additional blow to her hopes;

but in 1574 she sought, through George Douglas, to interest Cunningham of Drumwhassel, master of the king's household, in a scheme for kidnapping him to France; and though Morton's enemies preferred to retain the boy in Scotland, her communications began an intrigue which, four years later, caused Morton's removal from the regency. Subsequently Morton was appointed to the chief room and place in the council, but his final fall was foreshadowed by the arrival from France, 8th September 1578, of the king's cousin, Esmè Stuart, Lord of Aubigny. Owing to the forfeiture by the Hamiltons for their support of Mary at Langside, d'Aubigny might be reckoned next heir to the Scottish and English thrones after the Lady Arabella, daughter of Darnley's younger brother, who was in England; for the king's uncle, the Earl of Lennox, was childless.

D'Aubigny was not an emissary of Mary. Contrary to the advice of her Catholic agents, she was against making use of him. His ostensible errand was to congratulate the king on his acceptance of the government, and to be present at his state entry into Edinburgh, which was the occasion of elaborate ceremonial pomp and much popular rejoicing. On account of an Act passed after the state entry, d'Aubigny could not, as a Catholic, remain in Scotland for more than forty days; but he purchased a *supersedere* from being troubled for religion for a year. From early childhood James had had no companionship with a near relative, and he found it impossible to resist the advances of so accomplished an intriguer. To the great alarm of the Kirk he conferred on him the rich abbey of Arbroath, and created him Earl of Lennox. But the fears of the "faithful watchmen" were very soon superseded by the hope that they would find in him a devoted champion; for in a few months James was able to

announce that he had induced his cousin to accept a Protestant clergyman for further instruction in the Reformed faith. Speedily followed his acceptance of Protestantism; and, after signing the Confession, he, on 24th July 1579, sent a letter to the Assembly, professing his readiness to do his utmost for the Kirk's advancement. To the Catholics he represented all this as mere pretence; and, probably, he was prepared to deceive either party as best suited his interests.

In the overthrow of Morton the prime, though veiled, mover was Lennox, and it was made possible by the baseness of Sir James Balfour, the hostility of the Kirk, and the fickleness of Elizabeth in her conduct towards both Morton and the king. The execution of Morton, 2nd June 1581, on the ground of complicity in Darnley's murder, was, for the moment, a great triumph for Lennox. It enhanced his reputation with the Catholics; it greatly gratified Mary; it commended him to the Kirk; and it gave him unchallenged supremacy in the counsels of the king. Created duke in August 1581, he also received a large portion of the escheated estates of Morton; and he was formally recognised as second person in the kingdom. Had he boldly broken with the Catholics his career could hardly have been the total failure that it was, but boldness was not his forte, and duplicity was his besetting foible. Then the Kirk discovered that riddance from Morton did not mean riddance from Morton's ecclesiastical policy. Here the king was Morton's faithful pupil, and Lennox was his abettor. His conduct and that of the king about an appointment to the bishopric of Glasgow caused the fiery clergyman, Andrew Melville, in wildly mixed metaphor, to "inveigh against the bloody gully of absolute authority, whereby men intended to pluck the crown off Christ's head and wring the sceptre out of His hand"; and while Lennox and the Kirk were at

loggerheads, his trafficking with Spain and the priests became known.

Whether he was prepared to support the Catholic plot against Elizabeth, or desired to frustrate it by the high terms he imposed, is hard to tell. He stipulated that James should be confirmed and maintained on the throne by his mother's consent, for his own recognition as leader, compensation for possible losses, and the aid of 20,000 foreign troops; but his conditions were not granted. While desiring to inflame him "with the glory and grandeur he might gain from the enterprise," Philip meanwhile counselled delay; and rumours of the plot having reached the clergy, the Assembly, on 22nd June 1582, appointed a commission to proceed against him. It was only with difficulty that Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador in London, could now induce him to remain in Scotland. Mendoza describes him as reduced to a deplorable condition, but he was thought to have meditated the seizure of Edinburgh, when he was forestalled by the Protestant lords, who, on 22nd August, laid hold of the king as he was leaving Perth, and conveyed him to Ruthven Castle. Though lingering in Scotland and contemplating various plots on his own and the king's behalf, Lennox now showed such cowardly indecision that even his own servants held him in contempt. Ultimately the king obtained from Elizabeth a passport for him to proceed to France, and on 20th December he set out southwards. To Elizabeth he represented his aim to be the maintenance of the English alliance, but to Mendoza he explained that this was mere pretence to further his return to Scotland, and that, for the same reason, he intended in France to pose as a Protestant. He died in France as a Protestant in the following spring; and all that is certain is that he was capable of deceiving both Catholics and Protestants.

At first resentful enough at his detention by the lords, James gradually made a virtue of necessity, and agreed without demur to the Kirk's most assertive resolutions. His difficulties were so far beneficial that they induced France, from jealousy of Elizabeth's influence, to recognise his sovereignty and arrange for a representative at his court. The overtures of France he sought to utilise to persuade Elizabeth to grant him (1) possession of the Lennox estates or an equivalent in money, and (2) some definite assurance of his succession. But finding him to be little interested in his mother's liberation, Elizabeth was content to keep him in suspense, and proposed to defer an answer to his first demand until after an inquiry into the rights of aliens to inherit. With nothing to hope for from her, he became impatient of detention, and on 27th June 1583 escaped from Falkland to St Andrews, his avowed purpose being "to draw the nobility into unity, and to be known as a universal king." Meanwhile, the death of Lennox had lessened the political tension, though there remained the problem of how to deal with the Ruthven raiders. Here James was guided mainly by his new favourite, James Stewart, created Earl of Arran, who, on account of the asserted illegitimacy of the first earl, claimed to be now the second person in the kingdom. While through him, Gowrie, the leader of the raiders, was able to make his peace with the king, various forms of punishment were decreed against his confederates; and an order having been issued in October that terms must be made with the king before 31st December, and none of them having applied for pardon, they were declared guilty of *lèse majesté*.

Alarmed by Elizabeth's countenance of the refractory nobles, James resumed negotiations with the Catholics, and even, on 19th February 1583-4, made an appeal to the Pope for help, in which he expressed the hope, if

aided in his present needs, to be able to satisfy him not only as regards his attitude to his mother but in other matters. How far he was prepared to go cannot, however, be known, for no attempt was made to aid him, and the crisis passed away. A rendezvous of the discontented nobles at Stirling was frustrated by Gowrie's arrest at Dundee on 13th April. They fled south to England, and on 2nd May Gowrie was beheaded at Stirling.

The sympathy of the clergy with the raiders augmented the alienation between them and the king. Andrew Melville having more than hinted in a sermon that in freeing himself from the Protestant lords, James was forgetting the goodness of God who had made him king, he was compelled to leave the country; but the disposition of the Kirk to exercise a fatherly care over the sovereign could not be repressed, and it inaugurated a dispute which was to colour the politics of many succeeding generations. In the intrusion of ecclesiasticism into politics Knox had been quite as aspiring as, if less diplomatic than, Cardinal Beaton; and Andrew Melville and other clergymen were now proving themselves to be even more aspiring and less diplomatic than Knox. The Catholic Church had never pretended to complete official interference in State affairs. Under its auspices sovereignty was a recognised institution, and its officials were accustomed to treat the sovereign with the highest respect. On the other hand, while the Reformed Kirk of Scotland was ostensibly democratic, and thus more or less jealous of the sovereignty, its members were under as rigid a regimen as that of the modern Trades Union. With it priestly domination became as rampant as of old, and while it was as compulsory in its action as Catholicism, its system of belief was more austere, and its social repressiveness more stringent. Towards James

it openly assumed the position of dictation as regards both his private and public conduct. In the words of Andrew Melville, he was God's—that is, the Kirk's—"silly [weak] vassal," and he could meet its pretensions only by asserting his own divine prerogatives. The great constitutional struggle between Church and State and between Sovereign and Parliament in Scotland and England was created by the Reformation. Though often represented as a struggle for civil and religious liberty, it was really a conflict between two forms of absolutism—that of the Church and that of the Sovereign; and it was because of their mutual frustration in the course of the prolonged contest that civil and religious liberty has been able to reach its present stage of progress.

The rout of the insurgent nobles created a kind of clerical panic; and when James demanded from the Assembly their excommunication, it broke up in confusion, and the chief clerical leaders fled to England. Thereupon he got Acts passed May 16th-22nd, providing for his recognition as head of the Church and for the establishment of Episcopacy as in England; and on 22nd August Parliament also decreed that "all ministers, readers, and masters of colleges" should, within forty days, subscribe an agreement, acknowledging the king's spiritual supremacy and submission to the bishops.

It might have been supposed that an ecclesiastical policy modelled on that of Elizabeth would have obtained her cordial support; but she preferred to patronise the Protestant lords, and utilise them for her own ends. While declining to deliver them up, she pretended to listen to a proposal of the French king for reconciliation both with James and his mother on the basis of an alliance between France, England, and Scotland. Though nothing was likely to come of

this, it was frustrated by Mary, who, meanwhile, was hopeful of her son's conversion to Catholicism, and his 'championship of her cause. With this purpose she sent Fontenay as a confidential messenger to her son. On being presented with an emblematic sword from her, James gallantly swore to be always her good and loyal chevalier; but Fontenay remarked that he displayed no kind of filial interest in her welfare, not troubling himself so much as to inquire after her health, mode of life, or treatment by Elizabeth. Fontenay was therefore of opinion that little was to be hoped for from the "old young man" so long as he was guided by Arran and his lady, who, he affirmed, had "as complete control of the king as if they had bewitched him." The truth was, however, that James was bewitched mainly by his own interests. He hoped himself to come to terms with Elizabeth. With the help of Patrick, Master of Gray—the supposed confidential agent of his mother—he was now meditating a scheme that left his mother's interests out of account. The main difficulty with Elizabeth was her insistence on his coming to terms with the fugitive lords. Neither to himself nor Arran was this proposition agreeable; and she therefore utilised Gray to engage in a conspiracy with them for Arran's overthrow, which was effected at Stirling in November 1585, Arran making his escape.

James, with an eye on the future as well as the present, sought to make the best of the new situation, which he accepted without demur. He "acknowledged," says the historian Calderwood, "there was no need of words; weapons had spoken loud enough and gotten them audience to clear their own cause." On the other hand, the nobles decided not to interfere with the ecclesiastical situation, explaining that it was "not expedient to draw out of the king, so addicted to the

government of bishops, any reformation of the Kirk for the present, but to procure it by time and his own consent and liking." The disappointment of the clergy is vividly mirrored in a letter of James Melville, written on his arrival in Edinburgh from Berwick. "I looked," he says, "like one that had fallen out of the lift I was so amazed. For where, as I supposed, our folks should have used that authoritie which God had put in their hands, and purpose thoroughlie to go to reformation I find all contrariwise; the king playing *Rex*, scorning and vaunting all, boasting the poore, and bragging the rich, triumphing over the ministers, and calling them lownes, smaikes, seditious knaves, and so forth." Evidently Melville hoped that the clergy and not the king would be "playing *Rex*"; but on the contrary they were induced, at a convention at Holyrood, 17th February 1585-6, to assent to a kind of Episcopal Presbyterianism.

James now agreed to the recall of Archibald Douglas, who had fled to England on the apprehension of Morton; and after an interview with him he expressed the opinion that he was innocent of Darnley's murder "except in foreknowledge and concealing." This had been sufficient for Morton's execution; but Douglas, after trial, was acquitted. This attitude of James towards the Douglasses was significant of a lack of sympathy with his mother; and on 2nd July he ignored her in a treaty by which Elizabeth, in lieu of the Lennox estates, agreed to allow him a pension of £4000 a-year, and undertook to do nothing, and allow nothing to be done in derogation of his claims to succeed her, unless moved thereto by his manifest ingratitude. Her son's abandonment of her was perhaps the bitterest of Mary's many bitter cups; but it is idle to seek to judge of the case by ordinary rules. Mary's re-establishment on the Scottish throne, or her joint

sovereignty with her son, was, except through a Catholic revolution, a vain dream. The two were really champions of hostile faiths and rival claimants of sovereign rights. James was far from quixotic; but, apart from selfish reasons, he might well persuade himself that he had no option but to prefer himself, and therefore Elizabeth, to his mother, although this meant virtual assent to her lifelong captivity.

But of anything worse for her than captivity he had, of course, no apprehension. He knew nothing of the inner mysteries of the Babington conspiracy. It appeared to him merely in the guise of a plot against Elizabeth's life, and he therefore could not make light of it. Its success would also have been calamitous to himself, and even his mother's survival of Elizabeth might be so. Thus though he had not sought, like Elizabeth's advisers, to compass Mary's death, he could not be blind to the fact that it would be as convenient for himself as for Elizabeth; and notwithstanding the reflected stigma and shame on himself, he was evidently, like Elizabeth, less solicitous to prevent the execution than avoid the odium of consenting to it. Gray even suggested that his main difficulty would be met if Elizabeth disowned responsibility and found a scapegoat. She did disown responsibility, but not from consideration for James, whose later endeavours to make capital out of the execution by securing his public recognition "as second person and heir-apparent to the crown of England," she treated with mere contempt.

Gray would, if he could, have avoided the embassy on Mary's behalf. He recognised that whatever happened, he was certain to incur blame; but he had a worse reward than he bargained for. Made the scapegoat for the king, he was sentenced to death, and though the king spared his life, he had to leave

the country. In the king's confidence he was succeeded by Sir John Maitland—a younger brother of William—who in 1587 became chancellor.

By her will Mary had made over her interest in the English succession to Philip II. of Spain, who—as descended from John of Gaunt, and on the ground that James was a heretic, and the mother of the Lady Arabella of illegitimate descent—might be deemed the nearest Catholic heir. The new danger caused James to cultivate the friendship of the Guises and the Catholics; and besides continuing Beaton—his mother's representative—as his ambassador at Paris, he reinstated him and Bishop Leslie in their temporalities. This awakened new hopes of his conversion to Catholicism, but as Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador in London, surmised, he merely designed to follow a certain course in politics. Still the proposal of Guise to marry him to a niece of the Pope seriously disconcerted Philip II., who did his utmost to oppose the pious proposition. Mary's legacy had incited him to undertake, at last, the task of Elizabeth's overthrow. While not claiming the English crown for himself, he claimed the right to dispose of it. The great peril which Elizabeth had so long and so dexterously sought to avoid, at last, therefore, had come nigh her. The mighty Armada, bearing with it the hopes of the Catholic world, set sail for England; but the prowess of her seamen, seconded by the winds and waves, wrought such havoc on the gigantic armament that no second venture of the kind could be attempted. The Armada's destruction thus ranks with the great events of the world's annals: it meant the triumph of British Protestantism, and the doom of Catholic Spain.

To Philip's suggestion that he should support the enterprise, James had returned an ambiguous answer; and thereupon Philip sought to bribe the Catholic earls

to take up arms and "liberate their king," but the scheme miscarried. In reality James, who pretended to be anxious mainly for the security of his own kingdom, must have been as glad as was Elizabeth at the blow inflicted on Philip's towering pride. But though, at Elizabeth's instance, he made a show of proceeding against the Catholic earls, they soon again secured their liberty.

With the perils of the Armada past, the thoughts of James reverted to marriage. Through Elizabeth's intrigues, proposals made in 1585 for the hand of the Princess Royal of Denmark had miscarried, and she was now betrothed to the Duke of Brunswick; but an arrangement was now made for the marriage of James to the Princess Anne, which was celebrated by proxy 18th August 1589. The bride sailed for Scotland early in September, but tempestuous weather caused the ships to take refuge in Norway Sound. Impatient of delay, James now romantically resolved to set sail to fetch her home. Setting out on 22nd October, during a severe storm, he, notwithstanding popular forebodings—expressed perhaps in the ballad of *Sir Patrick Spens*—reached Norway in safety, the marriage being celebrated on 24th November. After some months spent in festivities and "drinking and driving ower in the auld manner," varied by learned discussions with Danish savants, he on 1st May arrived safely with the queen at Leith.

For a time there was now cordiality between him and the Kirk. Adopting towards it the experiment of gross adulation, he, at the close of the Assembly, in August 1590, fell forth in praising God that he had been born to be "King in such a Kirk, the sincerest Kirk in the world"; and "as for our neighbour Kirk in England," he declared, "it is an evil said mass in English, wanting nothing but the liftings." This so turned the heads of

the fathers and brethren that, for a quarter of an hour, "there was nothing but loud praising of God and praying for the king."

A new point of affinity between him and the clergy was also found in their common zeal against witchcraft. Owing to the lurid attractiveness of the more awesome portions of the Scriptures, this dark and degrading delusion was now, in Scotland, at the zenith of its potency. James had studied with avidity the sixteenth-century literature on the subject, and in his *Demonology* (1597) alludes to the "damnable opinions" of the German physician John Weier and of Reginald Scot in his *Discovery of Witchcraft* (1589) in maintaining the old error of the Sadducees in denying of the Spirits. Fearsomely curious about "the horrible and awfu'," he had been much impressed with Jean Bodin's *Traité de la Démonomanie* (1581), though he describes it as "collected with greater diligence than written with judgment." If this also holds of his own treatise, it at least gives a clear summary of the subject and of his reasons for the delusion that was in him. His zeal against the hellish art had been quickened by the story of a great wizard and witch assembly held at North Berwick under Satan's presidency to raise storms on the seas during his voyage from Denmark, and the information that certain wizards and witches had been approached by Bothwell to practice the taking of his life. Under his auspices witch trials were therefore instituted in different districts, over which he, deeming himself a special adept in witch-finding, often presided.

On learning of the charges against him Bothwell surrendered, but later made his escape. Almost as "hazardous" a person as his uncle, the fourth earl, and with little fear either of God or man, he did not

conceal his mortal hatred of Chancellor Maitland, who, "a puddock-stool of the night," occupied that place in the king's confidence which, as the king's cousin, he deemed of right to be his; and the king's suspicion that he was conspiring against him, "that he might succeed to the throne as the Earl of Atholl did against James the First," was at least excusable. For some years he defied all efforts to capture him, and by his bold contrivances exposed James to some grotesque struggles between his kingly dignity and his apprehensions. Ultimately the Bothwell episode became intertwined with a great ecclesiastical quarrel. The heavenly harmony between James and the Kirk had been of short duration. His high-flown flattery had encouraged the clergy to deal in the pulpit with the royal shortcomings, and they did not scruple to tell him that there was a judgment above his, "that is God's, put in the hands of the ministers." They were thus disposed to welcome the exploits of Bothwell as a special dispensation on their behalf. Even his own chaplain, old Mr Craig, preaching before him in December 1591, described Bothwell's forcible attempt to interview him in Holyrood Palace as "God in his providence" making "a noise of crying and fore-hammers to come to his own doors." They were further shocked by his recourse to the Catholic Huntly for aid against Bothwell; and the slaughter of Bothwell's near relative and supporter, the "Bonnie Earl of Moray," by Huntly's men, after his flight from his burning castle of Donibristle, led to a rumour that the king had instigated the murder on account of the queen's partiality for the "Bonnie Earl," though James protested that "his part had been like David's when Abner was slain by Joab."

But a still more sinister aspect was given to the king's relations with Huntly, by the discovery of "The

Spanish Blanks," papers with the signatures of Angus, Huntly, Errol, and others, which were to be filled in in Spain, in terms of an agreement for the despatch of men and money to Scotland. James being slow to call the conspiring earls to account, Bothwell began to pose as the champion of Elizabeth and the Kirk. But after giving him encouragement, Elizabeth, in her accustomed fashion, failed him in his need. The Kirk excommunicated the earls, and James gave them the option of renouncing Popery or leaving the country; and as they remained contumacious, he sentenced them to forfeiture and made a show of endeavouring their subjection. On this, Bothwell—Elizabeth having failed him—made common cause with the earls against the king. This left the clergy no option but to excommunicate Bothwell, who fled the country, whereupon James arranged that on condition of leaving the country the earls should retain their estates.

For favouring a scheme of the queen for transferring Prince Henry, born 19th February 1593-4, to Edinburgh Castle, Maitland fell under the king's displeasure, and on his death, 3rd October 1595, the king declared that never, henceforth, would he "use great men or chancellors in his affairs, but such as he could correct and were hangable." On 19th January 1595-6, the Exchequer was put into commission of eight persons known as the "Octavians." The ability of none could be disputed, but since some were reputed Catholics, the Protestant extremists supposed it to portend a "great alteration in the Kirk." In the Assembly of 1596 their dissatisfaction found vent in a resolve to call the king to account for occasional neglect "of reading of the Word at table," and of grace after meat, inconstant attendance at the sermon on week-days, indulgence in banning and swear-

ing, and keeping company with persons of whom they disapproved. They even took upon them to rebuke the queen for absence from the sermon and sacrament, "night walking, balling," &c. Further, they made a representation about "offences in the court and judgment-seat," and they also, in November, brought before him certain "special grievances," which need not here be detailed.

Their assertiveness, in fact, knew no bounds, and caused the king to "redd the marches" between him and them, by prohibiting them from referring in the pulpit to State affairs until after consultation with him; by declaring the Acts of the Assembly of none effect until ratified by him or his commissioners; and by restricting the jurisdiction of the Kirk to strictly ecclesiastical matters. This acted on them like a red rag, but he was quite their equal in argumentative vituperation and in conviction of his divine authority; and since also their practical was by no means equal to their theoretical power, victory meanwhile remained with him. An obstreperous clergyman, David Black, for various offences against the King and Queen of Scotland and the Queen of England, was ordered benorth the Tay; it was announced, on 14th December 1596, that stipends would be paid only to such ministers as subscribed a paper to the effect that the king was supreme judge "in all cases of sedition and treason," &c., and the same day the Assembly's commission were ordered to leave Edinburgh within forty-eight hours. On the 19th a tumult arose after his refusal to receive an anti-Catholic deputation, and next day he ordered the removal of the law courts elsewhere, and left for Linlithgow, whither the four Edinburgh ministers and others of the anti-Popery deputation were summoned to appear before him, but they fled the country.

The king now caused an Assembly to meet in Dundee in March 1597-8; and with a view to put an end to irregular clerical interference in civil matters, proposed that, as in former times, the clergy, as the Third Estate, should be represented in Parliament by the ministers promoted to prelacies. This was sanctioned, the number being fixed at fifty-one; and, at a Falkland convention in August, it was agreed that a vacant prelacy should be filled by the king out of six of the Kirk's nomination. It has been customary to take for granted that the Kirk, as representing the nation, was in the right as regards its disputes with the king: but (1) it is far from clear that the Edinburgh Assemblies represented the will even of the Kirk officials; (2) the nation might be in the wrong as regards its will, just as the king might be; (3) the overweening assertiveness of the clergy was certainly wrong; (4) James, however mistaken he might be about his divine authority, was no more mistaken than the clergy about theirs; and (5) he had no other option than to adopt the policy he did adopt, if he was to escape becoming the mere factotum of the Kirk.

In September 1598 James published his *True Law of Free Monarchies*, an exposition of the high supremacy of the kingly office as exemplified in the case of God's ancient chosen people, his thesis being that even against a wicked anointed king there was no remedy but "sobs and tears to God," according to that sentence used in the primitive church in the time of the persecution:—

"Preces et lachrymae sunt arma ecclesiae."

This tractate the Kirk let alone; but it was otherwise with the *Basilicon Doron*. Here was admirable matter for denunciation. Written for Prince Henry, whom God, James tells him, had "made a little God to sit on

his throne and rule over other men," it contained the real opinion of James about the Kirk and the nobility and the best means of circumventing them. The seven copies that were printed were entrusted to certain persons, to be secretly preserved until the prince was old enough for their perusal; but in September 1599 a clergyman got sight of a copy, and "drew out of it" certain passages, including one in which the clergy were described as "leading the people by the nose to bear the sway of all the rule." Influenced by this insight into the king's sentiments, the Montrose Assembly of March 1600 decided that the Kirk's parliamentary commissioners should be chosen not *ad vitam* but *annuatim*.

These high disputes were intermixed with the mysterious Gowrie Conspiracy. Did Gowrie conspire the capture or death of the king? Or were the deaths of Gowrie and the Master of Ruthven designed by the king, or due to a sudden quarrel between him and the Master? James contended that he himself was saved from sudden death only by his own alertness and athletic prowess. Gowrie and the Master were killed in the fray; but, not content with this, James placed the whole family under the ban of the law, directing that their very name should be abolished; and, to the end of his life, he made the 5th August a day of solemn thanksgiving for his escape. Some of the clergy were bold enough to express serious scepticism about his version of the "conspiracy," but were induced to retract their opinions—all but Robert Bruce of Edinburgh, who was compelled to leave the kingdom. Further, the king met the resolution of the Montrose Assembly by appointing bishops, with a seat in Parliament, to the prelaties as they fell vacant.

But more and more the thoughts of James were turning towards a greater sovereignty. Elizabeth was now manifestly ageing; a few years, at the most, would decide whether the splendid day-dream of James would be realised; and his policy was now directed mainly towards making his calling and election in England sure. While, with this view, he had begun the creation of a Scottish Episcopacy, he also did what he could to disarm Catholic hostility. With the Earl of Tyrone, with France, and with the Pope he adopted a tone fitted to flatter their hopes of his conversion; it would seem that he even permitted Queen Anne to authorise an envoy to profess Catholicism in her name at the Holy See; and on the *ci-devant* Catholic nobles he conferred various offices and honours, while with Huntly, whom he created marquis, he spent much of his time "wauchting and drinking."

His main difficulty was the intentions of the enigmatical Elizabeth; and the enactment of Henry VIII. against the Scottish succession was still unrepealed. This helps to explain the encouragement given by him to the plot of Essex. Happily its failure resulted to his advantage. Mar and the Abbot of Kinloss, sent to co-operate in the conspiracy, now entered into communication with Cecil. But for this, it is hard to say how the succession might have gone, for Cecil, as the right-hand man of Elizabeth, might well be doubtful of his future under James; but, on account of a friendly understanding now arrived at, Cecil virtually assured him of the succession, if he simply remained passive and left the matter with him.

In the end the Catholics were disposed to further the interests of the Lady Arabella; but Cecil's action in drawing up a proclamation of James shortly before Elizabeth's death, and obtaining for it, a few hours

afterwards, the sanction of the Privy Council, was decisive. The will of Henry VIII. was ignored—the prevailing desire of the Protestants being evidently for the union of the kingdoms under one crown. There had been outside the council a widespread feeling of doubt, uncertainty, and vague apprehension; and its definite decision was received with a keen sense of relief, if with no remarkable enthusiasm.

CHAPTER VIII.

JAMES VI. AND I.—AS BRITISH SOVEREIGN.

ELIZABETH died on Thursday, March 24, 1603; and late on Saturday night Sir Robert Carey, by means of relays of horses previously and privately arranged, arrived unofficially with the news to the Scottish King; but not till some days thereafter did he receive formal information from the council of his recognition as her successor. It was evidently advisable that he should proceed to his new kingdom as soon as possible; but he showed himself rather disregarding of ceremonials as regards his old kingdom in his manner of severing his close personal connection with it. Without summoning a Parliament to announce to it his acceptance of the English crown, he took no more formal leave of his Scottish subjects than by a characteristically quaint and self-important address, on 3rd April, at the close of the sermon at St Giles; and on the Tuesday following he set out on his southward journey, accompanied by various Scottish nobles, officials, and clergy.

The unprecedented spectacle of a Scottish monarch journeying with a peaceful cavalcade to take possession of the English throne attracted in England throngs of curious and well-disposed, if not excessively enthusiastic, spectators. Mayors and corporations testified

their loyalty by presenting him with purses of gold and other gifts; and the nobility, aware of his special love of the chase, gratified him by holding great hunting meets in his honour. Formalities, festivities, and sports thus somewhat protracted his progress, but the splendour of his new position, and the cordial tokens of loyalty he was receiving, must have placed him on the best of terms with himself, and in a mood to enjoy to the full such a unique holiday time. He had never hitherto been beyond the bounds of his hilly and bare native land, and during his leisurely journey in the late spring through the green low-lying lands of England, his curiosity must have been kept continually alert by the novelty of his experiences, and the appearance, manners, and speech of the crowds that flocked to behold the royal cavalcade. On his new subjects the impression he appears to have produced was fairly favourable. On horseback he had a rather imposing appearance, while his good-humoured friendliness placed those who came into immediate contact with him entirely at their ease. A certain oddness and bizarreness in his address, and his "swift and cursory" speech, in what Bacon terms "the full dialect of his country," must have jarred a little with the preconceived English notions of sovereign dignity; but underneath this there were sufficient glimpses of shrewdness and tact to inspire respect; and he had, be it remembered, no inconsiderable reputation for ability and learning, while his very eccentricities tended in the end, if not to contribute to his popularity, to create a certain tolerance, even for what were deemed his glaring errors and shortcomings.

During the last stages of the journey the crowds became so great as to be embarrassing, and as, on 7th May, he approached London, he "rode through the meadows to avoid the extremity of the dust."

The 25th July—the feast of St James the Apostle—was the day appointed for the coronation; but owing to the plague, it was through almost deserted streets that the royal procession passed to Westminster, where, after the lapse of many centuries, a Scottish king was again enthroned on the ancient coronation stone of Scone; and, in strange opposition to all the anticipations of the great English king who brought it thither, he was enthroned on it as King of England.

James VI. of Scotland, who now became sovereign of England as James I., might thus reckon himself to have been favoured of heaven far above any of his predecessors on the Scottish or English throne. It was his happy destiny to become the instrument of solving the long dispute between the two nations which had filled many previous centuries with constant battle and bloodshed, and of uniting their fortunes into a powerful confederacy, which rendered both secure, meanwhile, against foreign attack, and which was to result in the creation of an empire surpassing the fondest dreams of himself and of those who witnessed his coronation.

Doubtless, also, his own chief emotions were those of profound satisfaction and pride. Of the fate that was to be in store for his successor, and of the final failure of his dynasty, he had not the faintest apprehension; and if he recognised that the task of governing England could hardly be an easy one, he was at least profoundly thankful to have escaped, in a manner, from his Scottish difficulties, and to have his lot cast amongst a people accustomed to treat their sovereigns with more profound deference and respect than he had been able to win for himself either from Scottish nobles or ecclesiastics.

Meanwhile, he also adopted the wisest course he could in recognising his lack of experience in English

affairs, and placing himself mainly under the guidance of Cecil, whom, on 13th May, he created Lord Cecil of Essendon, and later, Earl of Salisbury. Under Elizabeth Cecil had learned the art of unobtrusive service, and his abilities being more of the useful than the brilliant order, were not of a kind to alarm the *amour propre* of the king. While, also, bestowing on his Scottish followers, as was natural enough, the chief places in the household, he made no change in the principal offices of State; except that the supremacy of Cecil necessarily implied the obscuration of Sir Walter Raleigh; and this again was bound to endanger Raleigh's liberty, if not even his life. His mere obscuration did not impair his power to plot—if so minded—against Cecil; but since, on the contrary, it might only incite him to do so, it was impossible for Cecil to rest content with this. For Raleigh's unjust trial and condemnation the chief responsibility rests with Cecil. If the king displayed a lack of insight or courage in the matter, it may be pleaded on his behalf that he could not have that knowledge of the necessities of the situation possessed by Cecil and the council. Moreover, the very vagueness of the evidence regarding Raleigh's connection with something mysteriously termed the Main Plot, and affirmed to be meant as a sequel to what was a real enough, if ridiculous, conspiracy termed the Bye Plot,—all this vague inscrutability allied to something actual, might well, in the case of a person of the temperament and Scottish experiences of James, create an uneasy sense of insecurity. He had also other reasons for uneasiness, for he could not but be aware that his present attitude to the Catholics differed considerably from that which he had adopted in order to disarm hostility to his accession. Under Elizabeth they had been quiescent, at first from belief

in her Catholic leanings, and latterly in the hope that after her death their position would become more favourable. But their expectations were very soon completely belied. James was really desirous, for a variety of reasons, to secure their goodwill; but his overtures to the Pope for some kind of reconciliation were interpreted in a manner that rendered it imperative for him, meanwhile, to change his policy. They led to the appointment of a Council of Cardinals to consider the condition of England, and to the offering up of prayers for his conversion, which, it was hoped, might be effected through Queen Anne. But James now denied that she did "believe in the Romish religion," and thought it "very preposterous for the Pope to serve himself of so improper a mean for his Majesty's conversion." The Pope's action gave him, in fact, no option—even for the sake of his Protestant reputation—but to put in force the recusancy laws. This created a somewhat dangerous situation. The strength of the latent Catholicism was considerable, and the renewal of a policy of repression was certainly exasperating.

Nor was the Catholic danger long in disclosing itself, though it did so in a manner betokening a very distorted conception of morality, and an almost lunatic idea of possibilities. It showed itself in the formation, by a band of Catholic fanatics, of perhaps the most grandiose conspiracy in history,—an attempt to effect the extinction of Protestantism through a holocaust of the King, Lords, and Commons, by blowing up the Houses of Parliament with gunpowder. Even had the diabolic project been partially successful, it could not have effected the triumph of Catholicism: it would only have doomed it to greater infamy than did the detection of the plot. Detection of it was also almost inevitable; and its conception, though it could not possibly have had the approval of the saner and wiser

Catholics, inflicted on Catholicism an evil repute from which, in the popular mind, it has not even yet recovered.

With the failure of the Gunpowder Plot the hope of a Catholic revival in England sank to zero, and the Catholic peril became more and more infinitesimal. The chief peril of the Stewart sovereigns, and even, in a sense, of Britain, was to be not Catholicism but the development of a great Protestant partition into Ceremonialism and Puritanism. For many years the great problem of the sovereign was to be how to deal with Protestant Puritanism and its possible political consequences; and on this Puritan rock the Stewart sovereignty was to be wrecked. In opposing a State Puritanism James found himself more or less at war with a parliamentary majority which was its mouth-piece; and a political agitation was thus created which in the next reign—aided largely by the tactical blunders of Charles I.—eventuated in Civil War, the abolition of the monarchy, and the short triumph of a kind of Puritan republic which developed into a Puritan despotism.

The turning-point in the reign of James I. in England was the decided—and even, in a sense, gratuitously provocative—stand he made against Presbyterianism and Puritanism at the Hampton Court Conference of January 1604, when he declared his policy in the sententious adage: “No Bishop, no King.” Here he had a magnificent opportunity for airing his ecclesiastical learning, and for promulgating, as sovereign pontiff of England, his decrees to a representative ecclesiastical assembly; and he took full advantage of it. Having a complete mastery of all the points under dispute, he was never at a loss for an opinion; and his learned and pithy expression of his sovereign sentiments evoked the unfeigned admiration of at least the Episcopal and

ceremonial party, one of whom records that in the discussions he showed himself "as expedite and perfect as the greatest scholars"; but his decidedly pointed remarks, in the "full dialect of his country," however much they might be relished by the High Church party, must have wounded more sorely than was quite necessary the feelings of the Puritans. He favoured, it is true, a preaching ministry; he welcomed also the proposal for a new translation of the Scriptures—a translation which, whatever its minor defects, seems as certain of a literary immortality as the plays of Shakespeare—and he was against attaching a superstitious significance to the use of the cross at baptism; but he would admit no omission of the Elizabethan observances; and it was his "constant and resolute opinion" that no church should separate itself further from the Church of Rome in doctrine and observance "than she had departed from herself when she was in her flourishing and best state." As for Presbytery, he declared in a kind of heat of passion that made him insufficiently watchful of the structure of his sentence—it "agreeth as well with the king as God and the devil." "Then," he continued, "Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick, shall meet and at their pleasures censure me and my council and all our proceedings. Then Will shall stand up and say 'It may be thus,' then Dick shall reply and say 'Marry, but I will have it thus.' And therefore, here, I must reiterate my former speech, *le Roi s'avisera*. Stay, I pray you, for seven years before you demand that of me, and if then you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipe stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you; for let that government be once up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath." Here he was, of course, speaking from his Scottish experiences, which were, perhaps, not quite applicable to England; but he was hardly astray in the supposi-

tion that Presbyterian Puritanism was, at this period of its development, a serious danger both to the hitherto recognised prerogatives of sovereignty and the immemorial conceptions of social liberty.

If, also, he was treating the Puritan party in a somewhat provocative fashion, he was not, in reality, acting towards them more cavalierly than did Elizabeth, nor than they were disposed to act towards their opponents and even himself; so indisposed were they to compromise with what they deemed a merely incipient Catholicism, so bent were they on a complete Puritan triumph. Because his stand and that of his successor against Puritanism ended finally in temporary disaster, it has been deemed by some a portentously stupid blunder—a blunder which a sovereign with the judgment of Elizabeth would have avoided; but the truth was that James was merely continuing her ecclesiastical policy. The Tudors had bequeathed to him an unsolved problem of an entirely novel kind; entirely novel, because Protestantism was entirely novel, as was also the claim of the sovereign to the headship of the Church. The problem was created by the revival in a new form of the old spectre of religious intolerance which had already brought countless woes on many generations. While Protestantism had seemed with the one hand to offer to the nations the priceless boon of religious freedom, it clutched it back with the other. Catholicism had sought completely to suppress the exercise of the intelligence in the sphere of religion; and while Protestantism had made a kind of escape from this extreme form of spiritual bondage, it was becoming increasingly manifest that it had made but a partial one; and England was threatened with a great conflict between two forms of Protestantism, each of which claimed for itself a kind of infallibility; while the ecclesiastical conflict was further complicated by

intermixture with a political conflict between the Sovereign and the Parliament. For Popery Protestantism sought to substitute what it supposed to be a theocracy regulated by the infallible directions of the Scriptures; and the political problem—which became urgent on account of the Protestant cleavage into Ceremonialists and Puritans—was how to retain or how to dispose of the sovereign. The burning question was whether the Church had a divine right to exercise ecclesiastically—and, in an indirect form, politically by means of the Parliament—a supreme control over the sovereign and thus to oust him practically from his office, or whether the sovereign had, by virtue of his ancient prerogatives, a divine right to the headship of the Church. In the end, both the political ambitions of ecclesiastical Protestantism and the ancient prerogatives of the sovereign became greatly modified. Parliament also succeeded in obtaining a definite authority in the management of State affairs, but in the end it found it impossible to do so as the mere mouthpiece of a persecuting ecclesiastical sect. It was mainly the internal Protestant conflict that brought about the peculiar constitutional development of Great Britain; but the change was not effected until the dominance of ecclesiasticism in politics had begun to subside. The great constitutional problem remained unsolved until the creation of a certain degree of religious toleration—a toleration which, at this stage of Protestantism, was undreamt of by the bulk of the nation.

In the days of James I. an approach to the civil and religious liberty of the twentieth century was merely impossible. Testing the ecclesiastical and political policy both of him and his opponents by modern standards, condemnation is easy enough; but it is through their inevitable errors and the price they

paid for them—in internal confusion, conflict, persecution, and bloodshed—that we have been able to attain to our present stage of political and ecclesiastical enlightenment. In France, Protestantism and the beginnings of civil and religious liberty were soon smothered by a Catholic absolutism; and after some centuries the gulf between the past and the present was bridged over by the concentrated energy—amounting to fury—of the great Revolution. In Britain the agony was to be more long drawn out; the triumph of civil and religious liberty was to be a gradual one, and the breach with the past was neither ecclesiastically nor politically to be so complete.

Clearly, neither the King nor the Parliament, neither the Ceremonialist nor the Puritan, was abstractly in the right to seek to overbear and, ecclesiastically or politically, destroy the other. But the conflict between them neutralised in the end their power to tyrannise, and transformed them into agencies for the nation's welfare. Unchecked by Puritanism, a sovereign absolutism like that of France might have been established in Britain; and, on the other hand, the intolerant tendencies of Puritanism unopposed by the sovereign might have inflicted on the nation a grievous social tyranny. Moreover, from his point of view, James had virtually no option than to resist the endeavours of the Parliament to trench on his prerogatives. No sovereign of the period could be expected to favour any form of Protestantism that threatened his sovereign supremacy, and to demand that he should have had the foresight to have—even in the midst of the ecclesiastical conflict and confusion of the period—bestowed that constitutionalism on Britain which has been the gradual growth of centuries, is to demand of him not merely the impossible but the absurd. Granted that, in various respects, he showed a lack

of wisdom as a sovereign, it by no means follows that the wisdom he lacked was to be found in the Commons. Indeed in the end the folly of the Commons was to out-rival even that of Charles I. ; and after the Restoration it was, in certain respects, to contrast very badly with the fairness and prudence of Charles II.

To judge aright of the case of James I. we must endeavour to look at the problem which he had to solve from his point of view. It was hardly possible for him to entertain any other opinion than that it was incumbent on him at all hazards to do his utmost to retain his sovereign supremacy. Not only so, but he might well deem an unfettered sovereignty the only adequate bulwark against a kind of social and ecclesiastical anarchy. True, it has been dreamed that a remedy for the ecclesiastical imbroglio was possible through some kind of reconciliation between the Ceremonialist and the Puritan, the Episcopalian and the Presbyterian ; and it has been imagined that this would have been an unspeakable blessing to England. But had this Utopian conception been realised, it is forgotten that the Parliament, having thus no quarrel with the sovereign, would have had no reason for seeking to encroach on his prerogatives ; and thus modern constitutionalism would have been strangled, so to speak, in the womb of Protestantism.

We are thus faced with this dilemma, that had James been a thoroughly successful sovereign—successful either in smothering Puritanism, in healing the great ecclesiastical breach, or in asserting his independence of the Parliament—it is far from certain that in the end this would have been to the advantage either of the country's civil or religious liberty. Again, it is hard to blame him for endeavouring to seek for such a solution of the question as would enable him to retain his sovereign supremacy ; but whether

he was right in this or not, his statesmanship must be judged by the character of the ability he displayed in endeavouring to overcome his difficulties.

For the position of one who undertook to be the supreme guide, political and spiritual, of Great Britain during perhaps the most difficult period of her constitutional and ecclesiastical history, it must be confessed that the qualifications of James could hardly, on the face of them, be reckoned so pre-eminent as he supposed them to be. There was even something almost pathetically ludicrous in the decision of the fates to entrust the fortunes of Great Britain during these perilous years to the keeping of the eccentric and pedantic British Solomon. To begin with, he was certainly, compared with Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, lacking in personal ascendancy. His physical appearance fell short of at least impressiveness; and his speech, besides being affected with a lingual defect, was, to an English ear, rude and outlandish. The notorious description of him by Sir Anthony Weldon is perhaps over accentuated: his large wandering eyes, his thin beard, his tongue too long for his mouth, which "ever made him speak full in the mouth and made him drink very uncomely as if eating his drink," his weak legs, which caused him to roll awkwardly in his gait and made "him ever leaning on other men's shoulders," his other ungainly habits and motions;—this gives probably on the whole an unfair impression of him, for it quite omits the *per contra*. He did apparently inherit some of the personal comeliness of his mother. Arthur Wilson definitely states that he was "not uncomely"; Nicolo Moulin, the Venetian Ambassador, even refers to him as of "noble presence"; and Cardinal Bentivoglio tells us that he was "of a fair and florid complexion, and lineaments very noble to behold." But his lingual

and physical defects made him a kind of caricature of a handsome man, just as his mental defects and eccentricities made him a kind of caricature of an able man; his mingled timidity and persistency a kind of caricature of a strong-willed personality; and his practical shrewdness, dexterity, and cunning, combined with his pedantic professorialism, a kind of caricature of a prudent and far-seeing statesman. Everywhere he was hampered by peculiar foibles and failings. In everything he showed himself a partial victim of the grotesque; and having, in addition, spent his early years largely in the company of the ruder Scottish nobles and his huntsmen and dependants, his manners were lacking in polish and finesse—one of his most ludicrous and unseemly peculiarities, even when only slightly irritated, being the spluttering out of volleys of oaths and curses, with which, in a casual way, he was also accustomed more or less to garnish his conversation.

Apart from vain swearing, his talk, which was copious and incessant, was tinged with much eccentricity. Of its learned discursiveness Sir John Harrington, in his *Nugæ*, has preserved an amusing instance too long to quote. Drawing on his stores of learning for the illustration of mere trifles, he often achieved a bizarre rather than a felicitous effect. His jests, in which he abounded, had sometimes an oddly whimsical cast—as, for example, his remark in the Bodleian on witnessing the books bound to their shelves with little chains: “I would wish if it were my lot to be carried captive, to be shut up in this prison, to be bound with these chains, and to spend my life with those fellow-captives which stand here chained.” A more elaborate and still quainter specimen is the method of announcing to Dr Donne his gift to him of the deanery of St Paul’s. Having

commanded him to dine with him—"When his Majesty had sat down, before he had cut any meat," records Walton in his *Life of Donne*, "he said, after his pleasant manner: 'Doctor Donne, I have invited you to dine, and though you sit not down with me, yet I will carve to you of a dish that I know you love well, for, knowing you love London, I do therefore make you Dean of St Paul's; and when I have dined, then do you take your beloved dish home to your study, say grace to yourself, and much good may it do you.'"

The mental and moral idiosyncrasies of James I., his learned and pedantic disputatiousness, his strange superstitious tendencies, his fantastic conceit and the peculiar character of his attitude towards the social, political, and ecclesiastical circumstances of his time, are mirrored very fully in his various treatises. He has expounded, and, it may also be said, exposed, himself more voluminously than any other sovereign has done. Among his most characteristic expositions—that in which his curious learning, his penchant for the *outré*, and the coalescence of shrewd intelligence with fantastic oddity and abject, though erudite, superstition are most picturesquely disclosed—is *Demonology* (1597). Here he is, perhaps, at his best and quaintest on witches, especially as regards their relations with the devil. Of the possibility of their being transported through the air he is convinced, "in respect that as Habakkuk was carried by the angel in that form to the den where David lay, so that I think the Devil will be ready to imitate God as well in that as in other things." Again, discussing "why there are more women in that craft than men," the reason, he tells us, is that the sex is frailer than men and more easily entrapped, "as was over well proved to be true of the Serpent deceiving of Eva at the

beginning, which makes him the homelier with the sex sin-sine" [since that time]. We have also the characteristic information that when witches are apprehended by the emissaries of the law, "their power is then no greater than ever before that ever they meddled with their master, for where God begins justly to strike by his lawful lieutenant, it is not in the Devil's power to defraud or bereave him of the office or the effect of his terrible avenging sceptre." The chapter on "the spirits that trouble men and women" includes an elaborate discussion on demoniac possession and the power of the Papists to cast out devils. In that on "the fairy" we are, rather disappointingly, informed that fairies and fairy-land are mere spectral creations of the devil for the delusion of the witches.

In quite other vein is the *Counterblast to Tobacco* (1604). Here his fantastic wit plays round an entirely mundane theme. Affirming that the fragrant weed was first used by "these beastly Indians, slaves to the Spaniards, refuse to the world, and as yet aliens from the Holy Covenant of God," he asks why we do not, as well, imitate them in walking naked, in preferring glasses and feathers to gold and precious stones, and even in denying God and adoring the Devil! His argument is a really delightful *non sequitur*. He then tackles, in most telling fashion, the various current statements as to the marvellous beneficial effects of its use. "O omnipotent power of tobacco," he then satirically exclaims, "and if it could cast out devils as the smoke of Tobias first did (which I am sure would smell no stronger), it would serve for a precious relic both for the superstitious priests and the insolent puritans to cast out devils withal." The diatribe concludes by banning the indulgence as "a custom loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, harmful to the brain,

dangerous to the lungs, and, in the black stinking fumes thereof, nearest resembling the pit that is bottomless !”

But the main bent of James was theological. For him the supernatural had an absorbing fascination ; and his sharp, logical, narrow, and pedantic intellect found a most congenial orbit in learned theological hair-splitting. At the royal meals he delighted to enter into friendly debates with his chaplains ; but at church, so far from displaying interest in the sermon, he frequently engaged in ostentatious—and sometimes far from decorous—converse with those in his company, his intention being apparently to indicate that as head of the Church, he was excepted from the exhortations of the preacher.

At the early age of twenty-two he had committed himself absolutely against the Papacy, in his exposition of the mysterious *Revelation of St John*. In later years he was not so disposed to proclaim that the Pope was “the King of the Locusts and the Son of Perdition.” To smooth his way to the English succession he had sought to flatter the hopes of the Papists ; and, in his first speech to the English Parliament, he “acknowledged the Roman church to be our mother church, although defiled with some infirmities and corruptions as the Jews were when they crucified Christ.” Similarly, in August 1603, he wrote to Henry IV. of France : “I am not at all heretic, and yet less is it possible to say I am separated from the Church ; I am of opinion that a hierarchy is necessary, and, therefore, I recognise the Pope as premier bishop of it, president and moderator of the council but not its chief or superior.” This is also his attitude in his *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance* (1608), and his spirited *Premonition to all Mighty Monarchs* (1609). In this famous attack on Cardinal Bellarmine, he says of the Pope : “Let him, in God his name, be *Primus*

Episcoporum inter omnes Episcopos and Princeps Episcoporum; so be it, and not otherwise, as Peter was *Princeps Apostolorum*. But as I well allow of the hierarchy of the Church for distinction of orders, so I utterly deny that there is an earthly monarch thereof, whose word must be law, and who cannot err in his sentence by an infallibility of spirit." Further, while asserting that Cardinal Bellarmine has "animated" him to prove the Pope to be Antichrist, "so as to pay him back in his own coin," he declares that the Pope will never make him recant "except he first renounce any further meddling with princes, in everything belonging to their temporal jurisdiction."

The main objection of James to the Papal claims to infallibility was that they interfered with the ecclesiastical and temporal rights of the sovereign. He objected to the Papacy, not to Catholicism. Here his position was very much that of Henry VIII.; only realising the difficulties of a Protestant sovereignty in a manner in which Henry VIII. was not in a position to do, he was exceedingly anxious for a reunion of the Church in Britain with the old Catholicism, but a Catholicism which would recognise the Pope merely as president of the Council. This would give the Council a certain ecclesiastical supremacy throughout Christendom, as to the exact character of which James was a little vague. But whatever the character or force of its decisions, no ecclesiastical court or official could, in his opinion, vie with the sovereign in authority. Some reference has already been made to his views on the sovereignty, as expounded in *The True Law of Free Monarchies* and the *Basilikon Doron*; and here it may suffice to quote a sentence or two from his speech at Whitehall, in 1609, which deals with the power and authority of the sovereign and his relation to the law. It contains this remarkable dictum: "The state of

monarchy is the supremest thing on earth ; for kings are not only God's lieutenants upon earth and sit upon God's throne, but even by God himself they are called Gods." "They have power," he also tells us, "to exalt low things and abase high things, and make of their subjects like men at the chess ; a pawn to take a bishop or a knight, and to cry up and down any of their subjects as they do their money." He admits, indeed, that they are bound to govern according to their laws, but only in the same way as the Almighty is bound to govern according to His laws. "Every just king," he says, "is bound to observe that paction made to his people by his laws, in framing his government agreeable thereunto, according to that paction which God made with Noah after the deluge : 'Hereafter, seed-time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall not cease so long as the earth remains.'"

Between James and the Almighty there was, however, this slight difference : he was not, even within his own sphere, so omnipotent a ruler ; his abstract right to supremacy did not, necessarily, imply his actual supremacy. Though "the state of monarchy" was of very ancient date, and though he himself was descended from a royal race which had been venerated and obeyed from remote ages, the fate of monarchs and of his own ancestors had often been a disastrous one. His title to supremacy did not practically rest on a more sure foundation than did the Pope's title to ecclesiastical infallibility. Whether the Papal infallibility was a marvellous delusion or a marvellous reality, it failed to operate over those who had the disposition, and were in a position, to ignore it. It had ceased to operate over James and the majority of his subjects. Unlike that of the Almighty, its influence was not all-pervading. Its sway had manifest bounds and limits. Its ascendancy depended on its prestige, on its power

to create a belief in its pretensions. Similarly, even if "the state of monarchy" was "the supremest thing upon earth," the actual supremacy of the monarchy of James VI. and I., or another, practically depended on the reverential regard of his subjects. He was not invested with any supernatural power to enable him to enforce his wishes. Could he convince his subjects that his sovereign personality was sacred, that he was sitting, as he affirmed, on God's throne, that resistance to his will was impious sacrilege, then, of course, no one could question either his power or his wisdom; and indeed only a very small depraved minority would be disposed seriously to question them, provided his administration was fairly unobjectionable. Still, the decline in the belief in Papal infallibility was beginning to lessen in Britain the belief in a kind of royal infallibility; and the internal Protestant cleavage was tending to shatter, more or less, the practical authority of the sovereign. Whatever ecclesiastical policy he might adopt, he was bound to give serious offence to a large percentage of his subjects.

Even yet, however, sovereignty in Britain, like Papal infallibility in Europe, had a great prestige,—a prestige derived from long tradition and the credulity or reverence of many generations. A certain divinity, even in Protestant Britain, did still hedge the king; even practically, his will was very comprehensively supreme. It was so for the reason that the whole administration of the kingdom was in his hands, or in the hands of persons appointed, directly or indirectly, through him. He had that possession which is nine-tenths of the law. Apart from rebellion, the only possible check upon his supremacy was the Parliament, which he had the power to summon or dismiss at his pleasure. Theoretically his position was absolutely supreme, for theoretically the Parliament had neither administrative nor full legisla-

tive power. It was a mere court of consultation. If summoned it might advise a certain course of action, or propose certain legislation, but whether the proposed course of action or form of legislation would take effect depended on the decision of the sovereign, who, although he could not, of himself, enact new laws, could, except where the laws definitely forbade, adopt any kind of foreign or domestic policy he thought proper. The only check which the Parliament could exercise over his action was through the refusal of supply. To a certain extent it could prevent taxation. The unjust oppression of the subjects was thus hindered, and the power of the sovereign to wage war was also limited. But, even as regards finance, the king was to a considerable extent independent of the Parliament, for in a strict sense he could "live by his own": he needed supply only in emergencies or for special and extraordinary expenses. But under Elizabeth the Parliament had been endeavouring to limit, as far as possible, the pecuniary independence of the sovereign; and the development of the Protestant cleavage was causing it, under James, to be still more bent on doing so. Still, he might have pretty well defied the Parliament, and, in the end, have greatly diminished its self-confidence, had he put a stronger curb on his too good-natured generosity, and been more inflexible about the wastefulness of his officials. His pecuniary difficulties, the difficulties which gave the Commons a certain hold on him, were mainly self-created. But for this, the discussion of the rights or wrongs of monopolies, impositions, patents, &c., and his various attempts to bargain with the Commons, might have been largely avoided, or, at least, he would not have needed to bargain with them at anything like so great a disadvantage; and had he been able to avoid, in the words of Bacon, "all possible occasion to make subjects proud and to think" his

"wants are remedyless but by Parliament," he would have been in a much better position to cope with the parliamentary and ecclesiastical ambitions of the discontented Presbyterians.

Here he was, so far, advantaged by his love of peace with foreign nations—with him a question of temperament as well as statesmanship. But in this instance his policy was, in any case, a wise one both for himself and the nation. Taxes for military expenses were avoided; and in other ways the country was, directly and indirectly, greatly benefited. There was a great advance in the betterment of the people and in commercial prosperity, and therefore in general contentment. And Britain was able to benefit by it still more in the future than in the present,—benefit beyond the dreams of that generation. The truce of Antwerp, 20th March 1609, heralded Spain's maritime decline and prepared the way for Britain's colonial empire, inaugurated by the planting of Virginia in 1607.

But for the great Protestant schism all might have been well with James. Apart from the great ecclesiastical quarrel and the great constitutional conundrum which it involved, he showed himself, in his general administration, a shrewd and capable enough ruler. But if it was beyond him, and would have been beyond another in his place, meanwhile to heal the quarrel or solve the conundrum, it might have been possible for wiser or stronger sovereigns than he and his successor to have somewhat mitigated the quarrel and its evil consequences so far as the dynasty was concerned; to have made an answer to the constitutional conundrum less immediately urgent, and to have considerably modified the answer given to it by the trend of events. For good or evil the peculiar idiosyncrasies of James and the character of the policy he inaugurated were greatly to affect the trend of events in Britain for

several generations. If they did not augment the country's ecclesiastical and political difficulties, they did much to determine their complexion, and they tended in various ways to hasten the development of a great ecclesiastical and constitutional crisis.

Stated shortly and generally, the aim of James ecclesiastically was the extinction of Presbyterian Puritanism, and constitutionally it was the full retention of the sovereign's ancient prerogatives. The latter aim dominated the whole of his ecclesiastical and political policy. The character of that policy—its merits or defects, its wisdom or folly, how far it failed from essential unsoundness, the fault of others or accidental bad fortune, and what were its chief results, good or bad, immediate or remote,—this in substance is what we have primarily to consider.

To enable him to complete his ecclesiastical purpose, James was specially anxious for an immediate constitutional union of the two kingdoms. In his first address to the English Parliament he announced to them, in his quaintly self-important fashion, that he had brought with him two gifts—"Peace with foreign nations and a union with Scotland." That the Parliament might hesitate to accept the latter gift, or seek to look it in the mouth, he apparently did not dream; but when he proposed that it should forthwith acknowledge the union in substance, and then agree to the name of the kingdom—the name he suggested being Great Britany—the proposed relegation of England to a subordinate position or an equality with Scotland, revived again the ancient sentiment which had caused centuries of quarrel between the two nations. The old shadowy claim of Scottish overlordship again asserted itself; and in a later discussion one of the members even declared that to place the Scot and the Englishman on equal political terms by a union of the two kingdoms

was no more reasonable than to place a prisoner at the bar on an equal footing with the judge on the bench. Probably had James proposed England as the name of the United Kingdom, there would have been no demur, but then he had to reckon with the Scots; and with all his peculiarities he was, also, proud enough of his Scottish descent and of Scotland's past. Thus to affront Scotland was in fact a mere impossibility. Here he was clearly in the right; and indeed with the statesmanship displayed in his speeches, as well as those of Bacon for the Union, the splenetic and narrow parochial bigotry of those opposed to it contrast very badly. True, the Commons were necessarily exempt from some of the more powerful motives by which he was actuated. His own mere glorification and the glorification of his dynasty always counted for much with him. In none of his speeches about anything did he ever fail to place himself conspicuously in the foreground; and in his elaborate oration on the Union in 1607—which was also thoroughly practical and even tactical in its tone, as well as learned and able in its substance—he did not neglect to suggest as the supreme consideration that the Union would make one body of both kingdoms under me your king, that “I and my posterity, if it please God, may rule over you to the world's end.” He had also ulterior ecclesiastical aims in pressing forward the Union, about which he was wisely silent. But apart from them, the advisability of the Union was patent enough; though the united eloquence of him and Bacon, and the utmost exertion of their ingenuity, failed to effect it. Had it been accomplished, the establishment of Episcopalian ceremonialism in Scotland might have been an easier task than it turned out to be. A union of the Churches would have followed, which might have greatly changed the complexion of the ecclesiastical and constitutional struggle

in Britain, whatever the final result might have been. The failure of the Union negotiations was a serious blow to the general ecclesiastical and political policy of James. It greatly hampered his scheme for the establishment of an Episcopal ceremonialism in the two kingdoms, as a preliminary to the realisation of his dream of a universal Non-Papal Catholicism.

With the death of Salisbury, 24th May 1612, the reign of James reached a further turning-point. Shortly before his death, the recalcitrancy of the Commons in seeking to bring pressure to bear on the king to abolish the Court of High Commission and otherwise interfere with his prerogatives, had caused the failure of an elaborate attempt to settle the chronic financial dispute between the king and the Parliament by what was termed the Great Contract. Probably it was its failure that fatally affected Cecil's uncertain health; and it so greatly affected his reputation that had he survived he, probably, in the words of Sir Dudley Carleton, "would never have been himself again in power and credit." His most likely successor was thought to be Bacon, and this was evidently the hope of Bacon himself, who might also well be convinced that the king could not do better than accept his services. "Now that he is gone," he wrote to the king, "*quo vivente virtutibus certissimum exitium*, I will be ready as a chessman to be wherever your Majesty's royal hand will set me." There was a certain courtier adroitness in this indirect allusion to the king's pronouncement as to his power "to make of his subjects like men at the chess"; but it did not avail him, probably to the king's loss as well as his own. With a free hand he might have done not a little to remedy the king's immediate evils. Some have even supposed that with Bacon at the helm all might have been well with James, and the disasters to the dynasty

avoided. But whatever Bacon's solution of a very difficult problem, it could not have been one according with modern constitutional notions. This, at such a crisis and at such a stage of ecclesiastical and political enlightenment, would have been merely to cut the knot, not to untie it. It would have meant disaster to the sovereign and to the nation similar to that which finally overtook it. If also, at one time, Bacon thought some kind of reconciliation between Puritan and Ceremonialist faintly possible, he had, either on account of the king's decided aversion to the Puritans or the education of later events, ceased to hope for this ; and in his letter of advice to Villiers some years later, he virtually homologated the king's policy. Apart from this, his views as to the relations between the king and the Parliament were essentially Tudor : with him the problem was mainly one of tact and management, in securing a subservient Parliament, in toning down its discontent, or avoiding the necessity of relying on its goodwill. To a certain extent James followed Bacon's advice, and with some temporary advantage, but he did not set Bacon in the position Bacon hoped for. He merely promoted him Attorney-General ; and objecting, as he said, to have "a secretary imposed on him by Parliament," he resolved to be his own secretary. Like other European monarchs of the period, as remarked by Ranke, he was seeking to fall back on a stricter absolutism not even interfered with by the Council ; but he had very special reasons of his own for doing so ; he knew that it would be increasingly difficult to induce the Council to agree with various details of his policy.

James had thus to fall back on his old device of associating a favourite with him in the administration of affairs. Cecil had not been quite in this position ; he had been acting largely on his own initiative, and

he had never obtained the king's full confidence. This partly accounts for the rapid rise into favour, even during Cecil's lifetime, of the youthful Scotsman, Robert Carr or Ker, created Viscount Rochester, and later Earl of Somerset. James was training him to be Cecil's successor. His displays of affection towards this handsome young man had a strange nauseating grotesqueness, but here, as elsewhere, there was method in his inevitable eccentricities. He wished to secure from him a certain filial regard and trust. If, also, haunted as he was by a curious melancholy tendency, he passionately sought refuge from it by continual diversion and bright and gay surroundings, and in the case of one in constant attendance on him, deemed good looks and a sprightly attractiveness a prime qualification, he had evidently taken careful stock of Carr's abilities and disposition. As he stated to Salisbury, he had "brought him up as a child"; and, moreover, his favourable estimate of him did some credit to his sagacity. Though ignored by modern historians, except Carlyle, there is even a striking agreement in contemporary opinion as to the ability and trustworthiness of Carr; and even after the estrangement between James and him, James wrote, "I must ingenuously confess you have deserved more trust and confidence of me than ever man did."

But the arrangement was bound to create discontent—discontent not merely amongst the Puritans, but amongst many otherwise favourably disposed to the king, and whom he could ill afford to offend. It did so even apart from the discredit brought upon the connection through the marriage—with the special sanction, and not very creditable help, of James—of Carr to Lady Essex, and the terrible denouement, resulting from the poisoning at her instance of Sir Thomas Overbury in the Tower. Nor, in the end, was

the king's special choice of Villiers, afterwards Duke of Buckingham, as Carr's successor, to have a happier—it was even to have a worse—issue. While the Carr episode did not a little to damage the repute of his royal master, the Villiers substitution was to have more definite evil consequences. It was greatly to help to make miserable the last years of James, and was to give, as we shall see, a turn to events that was fatally to affect the fortunes of Charles I., and indeed the whole futurity of the Stewart dynasty. If an arrangement of the kind was a sort of necessity for James, in both cases it must be reckoned amongst the contributory causes to his woe rather than to his welfare, and towards not the establishment, but the endangerment, of the sovereignty.

The position and prospects of James—and probably even the tenor of European history—were greatly modified by the assassination of Henry IV. of France in 1610. If the great device of James for the salvation of the English sovereignty by the establishment throughout Christendom of a Non-Papal Catholicism was ever to have a chance of even partial realisation, it was, primarily, through the possible support of Henry IV.; but apart from this, the survival of Henry IV. would indirectly have greatly altered the character of his political outlook, and therefore of his immediate purposes and aims. The sudden removal of the great French king must be reckoned amongst the more important of the mischances which were to combine to render nugatory his highflown calculations. The preponderant influence of the Papacy and the House of Hapsburg was for the time being assured; and the Hapsburg predominance partly explains the apparent incoherence of the policy of James in marrying, in 1612, his daughter, the Princess Elizabeth, to the Elector-Palatine Frederick V., the head of the Protestant

League, and seeking to marry his son Prince Henry to the Infanta of Spain. The Palatinate marriage would strengthen his influence with the Continental Protestants, and the Spanish marriage would place him on very intimate terms with what was now the principal Catholic Power in Europe. He would thus put himself in a favourable position to pose as a kind of mediator of Christendom, to bring his royal wisdom and his unique ecclesiastical dialectics to bear both on Catholics and Protestants.

But, as matter of fact, the Palatinate marriage was to prove by far the most unlucky of all his sapient achievements. But for it, the great Thirty Years' War might never have happened; for Frederick, without the hoped-for support of an English father-in-law, would hardly have ventured to accept the crown of Bohemia. By reason of the very critical character of the Protestant and Catholic quarrel, royal marriage arrangements were, at this period, a more vital factor in European politics than perhaps they ever were previously, and certainly much more vital than they were to become in subsequent centuries. Still here, as elsewhere, the best-laid schemes even of kings were apt to have a quite different result from that anticipated. It was then even more difficult than now to forecast the future of European events. James can hardly, therefore, be blamed for not foreseeing that the Palatinate marriage might eventuate in the Thirty Years' War, and in the end render the Spanish marriage impossible. His policy was highly speculative, but properly to appreciate his standpoint, and to judge of the reasonableness of his hopes of a general Non-Papal Catholicism, we must avoid judging them merely in the light of their failure. Certainly he cherished an overweening conception of his own importance and his superior wisdom; but it must be borne in mind that

he had a very high reputation as a learned ecclesiastic, that he was a royal ecclesiastic and a powerful Protestant monarch, and that the gulf between Protestantism and Catholicism was not then so absolute and fixed as it has now become. Those who would really settle the question would not be the Pope but the European sovereigns; and judging sovereign human nature by his own, it is not altogether surprising that he did not count it quite a forlorn hope to seek refuge from the Protestantism that was threatening his sovereignty, by the establishment in Christendom of a Non-Papal Catholicism.

After the death of Prince Henry in 1612, the Spanish marriage project was renewed on behalf of Prince Charles for the hand of the Infanta Maria. For this pursuit by James of the Spanish will-of-the-wisp, Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador in London, was deemed to be mainly responsible. In England it was almost necessarily supposed that James was merely being made a tool of by Gondomar; and some even yet hold this opinion. But the foolishness of James, if it was foolishness, was mainly his own foolishness. He was influenced by his own very peculiar motives. The splendour of the match no doubt appealed to him; but he had also very special purposes of his own in view. Gondomar, again, strongly desired the marriage, because he thought it would imply the final establishment of Catholicism in Britain; but he was favourable to it on less stringent conditions than his master and his ecclesiastical advisers were. The main impediment at this time was Spain's Catholic stipulations: that all the children should be educated under the mother's care, and that if, on coming of age, they embraced Catholicism, they should not be debarred from the succession. James would not accept these conditions; but while intimating that they might form a subject for

negotiations, he for this purpose was prepared to grant a commission to the Earl of Somerset, on condition that Spain granted a commission to Gondomar to treat further of the matter.

The completion of these arrangements was suddenly foiled by the discovery of the Overbury murder. This both ruined Somerset's reputation and set back the negotiations; and while they were in suspense, the opponents of Spain sought to draw a red herring across them by a proposal to liberate Sir Walter Raleigh, that he might command an expedition to Guiana in search of what he declared to be a rich deposit of gold on the banks of the Orinoco. The dazzling possibility of untold wealth appealed at once to the king's wondering credulity and his pecuniary needs; while he was also meanwhile in a mood to stand on his dignity with Spain. Notwithstanding, therefore, the representations of Gondomar, there was little difficulty in obtaining his assent to the enterprise, but only on condition that Raleigh was not to act on the offensive or meddle with territory in Spanish possession. These conditions Raleigh disgracefully violated by attacking and burning the town of St Thomé; and whether or not he had any good reasons for expecting success in his quest, it was a complete failure. Since, therefore, he was merely a liberated and unpardoned political criminal, his second offence—in this case palpable enough, quite inexcusable and grossly insulting to Spain, with which James was on specially friendly terms—rendered his execution on the old sentence a foregone conclusion; and it took place in old Palace Yard 22nd October 1618.

While Raleigh was engaged in his adventure, James, in the end of March 1617, set out to visit his native land. In his farewell speech he had promised to do so, "every three years at least or oftter." But with his

residence in England, his idea of his self-importance rapidly augmented, and his attitude to the land of his birth became very similar to that of his predecessors on the English throne. After four years had passed he thus referred to it in the English Parliament: "This I must say for Scotland and may truly vaunt it: here I sit and govern it with my pen; I write and it is done; and by a clerk of the council I govern Scotland now, which others could not do by the sword." He was able to do it mainly through the general support he had won from the Scottish nobles, partly from gifts of church lands, partly by the new respect entertained for him as King of Great Britain. As the result of his now commanding position, the bishops in Scotland, hitherto without jurisdiction, were, in 1606, appointed "constant moderators of Presbyteries and Synods": in 1610 a form of Episcopal rule was established, after which Archbishop Spottiswoode and three others obtained consecration in England; and in 1612 Parliament delivered the bishops from subjection to the Assembly. What had now to be effected was the completion of the ceremonial assimilation to England—by far the most difficult part of his task. In 1616 a ritualistic service was agreed to by an Aberdeen Assembly; but since the clergyman was permitted to "conceive his own prayer," James quaintly described the result as "mere hotch-potch."

Though declaring that he was now drawn towards Scotland by "a natural and salmond-like affection," his visit was dictated more by policy than sentiment. He desired to bring his immediate influence to bear on a final effort to complete the ceremonial assimilation between the two kingdoms. For this reason he entered his northern kingdom with a magnificent retinue, for which Edinburgh found it difficult to obtain accommodation; and everything was done to

impress his old subjects with the immense accession to his dignity and power through his sovereignty of England. In his various palaces splendid preparations were made for his reception, and his progress through the country was, so to speak, punctuated by grandiloquent poems and by fulsome addresses, "full," as Carlyle remarks, "of drowsy bombast, like tales told by an idiot." For the occasion he had also arranged that an organ should be erected in Holyrood Chapel, and that a band of choristers should be trained to conduct the service in the Anglican manner; and on his arrival the chief Scottish officials were requested to attend the service and receive the communion in the kneeling position. The real purpose of his visit and of his elaborate display of royal magnificence was disclosed, when to a St Andrews convention he, on 13th July, presented articles (1) for kneeling at communion, (2) administration of communion to the dying, (3) administration of baptism on the first Sunday after the birth, (4) the observance of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, and (5) the observance of confirmation. A St Andrews Assembly in November—James was avoiding Edinburgh Assemblies—while agreeing, with reservations, to Article 2, deferred consideration of the others; and although at a Perth Assembly, of 25th August following, all were agreed to, this, as we shall find, by no means meant the nation's full acceptance of them. They were, in fact, the germ of the great Covenanting struggle; and that they should have contributed so much as they did to the promotion and determining of the momentous events in the near future of both countries, strikingly illustrates the wonderful difference in ecclesiastical sentiment between those times and ours.

Having observed that in Lancashire the strictness of the Protestant Sunday was a grievous offence to

many, James—influenced both by his own predilections and his special ecclesiastical policy—after his return south, issued a *Declaration of the Liberty of Sports*, prohibiting interference with the ancient immemorial recreations of the day. It was to be read in all churches throughout the kingdom; but so strong had the strict Protestant Sabbatarianism already become, that in the end he found it inadvisable to insist on the reading of the order.

In 1618 James—with the aim, we must believe, of promoting his great scheme for an ecclesiastical reconciliation of Christendom—issued *The Peace Maker*, in praise of the prevailing concord among the nations: “O blessed Jubilee, let it be celebrated with all joy and cheerfulness and all sing *Beati Pacifici*”; but, alas! hardly had he given utterance to his glowing and benevolent hopes, when suddenly all Christendom was set on fire by the reckless act of his own son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, in accepting, in 1619, from the revolted Bohemians the Bohemian crown, in opposition to the Catholic Ferdinand of Styria, whose right of inheritance had, in 1617, been admitted by the Bohemian Diet, and who, in August 1619, had also succeeded Matthias as Emperor. On being offered the crown, Frederick wrote to James for advice, but closed with the offer before even an immediate answer could possibly have reached him. This was a confounding, an almost stupefying blow, to the policy of James: it seemed to scatter all his fondest anticipations to the winds. That his Protestant Parliament were insistent on help being sent to his son-in-law still further increased his perplexity. But though in a cruel dilemma, he was firm as regards his old convictions and his relations with Spain. He could not, he said, help his son-in-law in his ambition until he had inquired into the legality of his election; and having given this full con-

sideration, he expressed the opinion that while the States were not bound to have admitted Ferdinand as king, once they had done so their act was final; they could not undo the election. Further, on being pressed to interfere for the sake of Protestantism, he replied: "Who made me a judge over Bohemia?" Within his own territory every king in his opinion was the supreme judge in religion; and indeed should James claim the right to interfere with Ferdinand on behalf of the Bohemian Protestants, there was no reason why the Spanish or any other sovereign should not interfere with himself on behalf of the English Catholics. He had, besides, a sincere horror of a religious war; and indeed for him to take up arms on behalf of European Protestantism would be to renounce all hopes both of the Spanish marriage and of a reunited Christendom. He decided, therefore, to limit his interference to the protection of his son-in-law in the possession of the Palatinate; and on his defeat at the battle of the White Mountain, 29th November 1620, and flight to Breslau, he hoped to recover for him the Palatinate through peaceful negotiations. If this failed he was, he affirmed, prepared to spend his crown, his blood, and his son's blood in the quarrel. But this magniloquent declaration was not to be put to the test. The Elector was to prove both his own worst enemy and the fatal bane of the English king in at least his primary ambitions. His insistence on quite impracticable terms made it impossible either to aid him or to secure the discontinuance of the war. Then the Commons would not, except on unacceptable conditions, support James with an adequate grant of money. They insisted on a great Protestant crusade, the renunciation of the Spanish marriage, and a Protestant betrothal. He was thus driven to propose that Frankenthal, the one stronghold of the Electorate

that remained untaken, should be sequestered into the hands of the Infanta Isabella, the governess of the Spanish Netherlands, until terms of peace could be arranged; and, in hope of Spain's good offices on his son-in-law's behalf, he, on 2nd January 1622-3, signed the marriage treaty.

The delicate negotiations connected with the completion of the marriage arrangements were left in the hands of Digby, Earl of Bristol, the ambassador at Madrid; but this arrangement was upset by the resolve of Charles, accompanied by Buckingham, to proceed to Madrid to prosecute his suit in person. From paternal fondness, combined with perplexity, James was induced to yield to the solicitation of his son; though Clarendon affirms that, after a night's consideration, he conjured Buckingham and Charles "with sighs and tears that they would no more press him to consent to anything so contrary to his reason and understanding and interest, the execution whereof would break his heart." What might have been the result but for the immense indiscretion of Buckingham and Charles it is not quite easy to determine. Charles was induced to it very much in the interests of his sister Elizabeth, for he took the Palatinate disaster more sorely to heart than his father did; but the main consequence of the visit was necessarily to heighten the Spanish demands, which now almost embraced the conversion of Charles to Catholicism. Short of this, remarkable stipulations were made, to which Charles, for a variety of reasons, was induced to profess consent. Apart from the Palatinate question—which to Charles was the crux of the situation—an important difficulty was the refusal of Spain to permit the Infanta to leave for England until the following spring; and while Charles and Buckingham left on the understanding that the marriage would be celebrated

by proxy, they by no means intended that this should happen; and at their instance James decided on its postponement until a settlement was arrived at in regard to the Palatinate.

With the collapse of the Spanish marriage project, James virtually allowed the sovereignty to pass from his hands. With all his grandiose calculations completely upset, his colossal self-confidence had been rudely shaken, his spirit was almost broken, he had become merely "a very foolish, fond old man." In almost everything he was now overborne by Charles and Buckingham, to whose predominance he submitted with listless passivity, varied by partial revolts and occasional remonstrances and warnings. On 23rd March 1624, he agreed to the abandonment of the Spanish treaty; but still clinging, so to speak, to the wreck of his fortunes, he, in opposition to Buckingham, resolved if possible to remain at peace with Spain, and to limit his efforts on behalf of European Protestantism to the recovery of the Palatinate. At the instance, however, of Buckingham, and in the hope of French aid on behalf of the Palatinate, negotiations were now begun for the marriage of Charles to Henrietta Maria of France. It was the most brilliant match now available, and, with a difference, it promised similar advantages to those that were hoped for from the Spanish marriage. To effect it James was induced to promise a kind of Catholic toleration. Though he declined to insert any such clause in the treaty, he humiliated himself by a private engagement not to interfere with his Catholic subjects in "the secret exercise of their religion," provided "they behaved modestly," &c.; and the marriage treaty was signed 10th November 1624. What would have happened had a Spanish marriage been effected it is vain to speculate; but the French connection was to prove

a dominating influence on the whole future of the Stewarts of the older line, whether on the throne or in exile, and its influence was to be mainly disastrous.

James was not to live to see the marriage completed. After the final break with Spain he had aged very quickly. His too constant indulgence in stimulants had been gradually undermining his constitution, and mental bewilderment and despondency, caused by disaster to his fondest anticipations, tended both to increase the habit and its hurtfulness. Possessing, like his descendant Prince Charlie, an exceptional ability to carry his liquor, he had accustomed himself to the daily imbibment of strong and sweet wines to an extent that would have prostrated an average man; and latterly the habit tended to produce physical and mental lassitude. So lazy and unwieldy did he become that, Roger Coke tells us, he had to be trussed on horseback, and rode without poising himself in the saddle. A severe attack of gout about Christmas 1624 confined him for some time to his chamber; but on 1st March he was at his hunting seat at Theobalds. On the 5th he was, however, attacked by a tertian ague, and the trouble was probably aggravated by his repugnance to the prescriptions of the physicians, and his preference for certain remedies suggested by Buckingham and his lady. By the 23rd his case had become hopeless, and he died on the 27th. On 5th May he was buried, with great solemnity, in the chapel of Henry VII. in Westminster Abbey, whither he had removed the body of his mother from Peterborough Cathedral.

Whatever the failings of James as a sovereign, account has to be taken of the immensity of his difficulties. The political and ecclesiastical confusion which was an inevitable consequence of Protestantism

was more and more threatening a crisis—a crisis which could hardly be prevented, however in the end it might be overcome. In Ireland it had greatly aggravated political discontent, because of the endeavour to impose it on a native population which was either unripe for it or whose genius was opposed to it. James made a somewhat notable attempt towards a partial solution of the Irish difficulty by the Plantation of Ulster. From the native Irish point of view it was a most arbitrary and odious expedient, and it was not effected in a manner to minimise its odium; but justice was then rude and rough, and in all likelihood had a similar expedient been applied to the rest of the country, the Irish difficulty would, several generations ago, have been practically solved.

In Scotland—owing to his additional prestige as sovereign of England and the revival of the ancient jealousy between the nobles and the clergy—he had been able to avert the dominance of a deceptively democratic Protestantism, the social burdensomeness of which would, but for his interference, have been more severe than it was; but both in Scotland and England his ecclesiastical triumph was more apparent than real. Its permanence was more than dubious. In England it was with difficulty, and only by the aid of harsh enactments, that he had his own way. He found himself hampered, financially and otherwise, by a recalcitrant Puritan Commons; and while in the Commons a sense of political potency had been generated which seriously threatened his sovereign prerogatives, the Palatinate difficulty had dissipated the idealistic vision of a reunited Christendom, which would re-establish sovereignty on the basis of the sovereign's headship of the national churches. He left the great constitutional and ecclesiastical difficulty quite unsolved; whether he had really aggravated it would be

hard to decide ; but his peculiar idiosyncrasy—as represented both in his theories and his achievements, good or bad—gave that turn to the constitutional struggle which, other causes co-operating, was to be, in the near future, so fruitful of strange and bewildering occurrences.

On the whole, though much that he did and designed to do met with but little general approval, he was not an unpopular sovereign. His good nature, his witty tendencies, and even his foibles and eccentricities, helped to cover the multitude of his sins against the nation's prejudices. If not greatly venerated or admired or loved, he was tolerably well liked. As a jovial sportsman—a pioneer in horse-racing, an ardent follower of the chase and a zealous champion of popular amusements—he commended himself to the goodwill of a large proportion of the gentry and the multitude ; and it must be remembered that the great mass of English people were not so strenuously interested in constitutional and ecclesiastical disputes as the proceedings and remonstrances of the Commons might seem to indicate.

The learning and accomplishments of James also lent a certain lustre to his reign even outside his own dominions ; and his patronage of learning, poetry, and the drama gave no inconsiderable stimulus to the literature of his time. English literature owes much to the strong discountenance of Puritanism by him and Elizabeth. Had he and Elizabeth permitted it to have the free course that it desired, the greatest dramas of the English theatre would have had no existence. James was a frequent listener to the plays of Shakespeare, who probably devised *Macbeth* for his particular gratification. On a special occasion he is known to have written the dramatist and lessee “an amicable letter with his own hand” ; and we can hardly doubt

that the immortal Will was more than once privileged to listen to his gracious and patronising congratulations. With Shakespeare's friend, Ben Jonson, the poet laureate, he had long and frequent discussions on poetic topics. With him he was brought into more frequent contact, through his employment in the arrangements of the Court masques and other entertainments, in which Queen Anne specially delighted. Another poet frequently employed in connection with the Court festivities was Samuel Daniel, who had license to train up a company "to be called Children of the Revellers to the Queen," and wrote several masques for special occasions. The gaities of the queen were not an unimportant item in swelling the royal expenses, but her Papal flirtations, as well as her other flighty and fickle ways, gave James perhaps more vexation than her spendthrift habits. Their joint delight in the Court recreations probably also helped not a little to soften their quarrels and smooth their differences; and if on both sides there was a lack of full sympathy and strong affection, there was, notwithstanding occasional cross purposes of some acuteness, a kind of understood tolerance for one another's shortcomings. Besides Ben Jonson and Daniel, other poets in special favour were Donne, who became Dean of St Paul's, and Beaumont, whose sonnet, *My Lord of Buckingham's Welcome to the King at Burley*, James condescended to answer in verse. Various Scottish aristocratic poets were also specially patronised by James, including Drummond of Hawthornden, Sir Robert Ker, and Sir William Alexander, afterwards Earl of Stirling.

The Collected Works of James appeared in 1616; a *Meditation on the Lord's Prayer* in 1619; and *Meditation on Certain Verses of Matthew* in 1626; selections from his writings, edited by R. S. Rait,

appeared in 1900 and 1901; and *New Poems*, edited by Allan F. Westcott, in 1912.

By Queen Anne James had three sons and four daughters, of whom two sons and a daughter survived infancy. Henry, born 19th February 1593-4, died 6th November 1612, might, had he survived, have saved the immediate fortunes of the dynasty, but whether in the end to the benefit of the nation is another matter. Elizabeth, born 15th August 1596, was, by her marriage to the Elector Palatine, to be the means of inflicting a mortal blow on her father's dearest ambitions; and her descendants in the Hanoverian line were also permanently to oust from the British throne the later descendants of her only surviving brother, Charles, born 16th November 1600.

CHAPTER IX.

CHARLES I.—THE PREPARATION FOR THE TRAGEDY.

CHARLES I. was born in Dunfermline Palace 19th November 1600, “about eleven hours at night.” His christening, on 23rd December, was hastened by doubts of his survival; and it was performed privately. According to an MS. in the Lyon Office—purporting to be the record of John Blencowe, Islay Herald, and printed in *The Royal Martyr or True Christian*—it was performed in the Chapel-Royal by David Lindsay, Bishop of Ross. Was the MS.—as has been affirmed—a forgery? Did the ceremony take place in a chapel? Was the officiating clergyman an actual bishop or only a kirk minister? These questions, momentous though at one time they appeared to many, need not here be discussed. On the occasion the infant was created Duke of Albany, Marquis of Ormond, and Earl of Ross.

The boy’s health continued so delicate that when the Court, in 1603, removed to England, he was left behind in charge of Lord President Fyvie until the following year. Created on his arrival Duke of York and made a Knight of the Bath, he was transferred to Lady Carey, wife of Sir Robert, afterwards Earl of Monmouth, who in his *Memoirs* affirms that those who bore them “no good will were glad of it, thinking that

if the duke should die under our charge it would not be thought fit we should remain in Court after."

In a modified form Charles inherited certain of his father's physical peculiarities. Owing to a muscular defect he could not articulate with clearness; and so weak were his ankle-joints that he was long unable to walk. Lady Carey, Monmouth tells us, had many battles with the king as to his treatment. He wished the string of his tongue cut and his legs put into iron boots, but she successfully insisted on leaving the remedy to nature; and though he always spoke with a slight stutter, he became physically vigorous and quite an adept in vaulting, tennis, archery, and riding at the ring. In his seventh year he was placed under the tuition of a Presbyterian Scot, Thomas Murray, which rather disturbed the bishops; and later, the predominance of Scotsmen in his household awakened fears that he might become "ill affected to the government and worship of the Church of England"; but, as he himself once remarked, he also "sat at the foot of Gamaliel": on behalf of the Episcopal and ceremonial policy of his father he was in fact to sacrifice his crown and life.

Like his father, Charles was a diligent and apt scholar—in this respect greatly excelling Prince Henry, who, on being taunted with his inferiority in studious zeal to his brother, jocularly remarked that, on becoming king, he would make him Archbishop of Canterbury. Charles could hardly have been any more successful as Archbishop of Canterbury than he was as British sovereign; he would have been better fitted as Cardinal or Pope. He possessed very good abilities of a sort and very varied accomplishments; was an excellent linguist, a good mathematician, a skilled virtuoso in painting and other fine arts, had an enlightened appreciation of literature, and was as well

versed as his father in theological lore and in the laws and statutes of the realm. In other respects he differed greatly from his father. His manners had a cold faultlessness; he was essentially a gentleman in bearing, speech, and habit of thought; indeed quite a model young man, guiltless, apparently, of any of the usual indiscretions of youth, and without a tincture of eccentricity or a touch of humour. His more prominent gifts and graces and faults were those of the sincere, amiable and conscientious, but rather narrow ecclesiastic. His piety was genuine, his ecclesiastical convictions irreversible, and he was fanatically devoted to his own form of ecclesiasticism. Had he not inherited a throne and had he entered the ministry of Rome, he might have become one of the most distinguished of its dignitaries, instead of one of the most ineffectual and unfortunate of kings. For the peculiarly difficult position of British sovereign, at this period, his qualifications were almost quite the reverse of what were needed. He did not, like his father, have the advantage of a perilous and trying apprenticeship; he had inherited none of his practical shrewdness; he had no proper sense of the actualities of the world; he was a kind of royal recluse; and if his deportment was faultlessly proper he lacked his father's sociality and easy affability. In certain circumstances he might have been highly respected, but he never could have made himself very popular. Though quite good-hearted, his reserved manners tended to produce a chilling effect. In this respect he strikingly contrasted with his son Charles II., of whom the Earl of Aylesbury tells us that "it was a saying that he would send away a person better pleased at receiving nothing than those who, in the good king his father's time had requests granted them."

The possible strength of Charles I. lay in his potent convictions; in what may be termed his thorough and

immovable partisanship; in the persistency with which he clung to sovereign absolutism and in his whole-hearted devotion to Episcopal ceremonialism. In the peculiar political and ecclesiastical condition of England at this period, much, as regards the retention of his prerogatives, depended on the sovereign's unbending will and his ability to produce the impression that it would be very dangerous and difficult to thwart it. But the fatality of Charles was that while strong in conviction he was both imprudent and weak in action. While his fanatical one-sided partisanship overwhelmed any practical tact he may otherwise have possessed, he had also inherited a peculiar form of his father's constitutional timidity. Not only did he by his extreme and tactless zeal create difficulties for himself, but when brought face to face with a formidable obstacle to the attainment of his wishes, he shrank from dealing directly with it; he sought to evade and circumvent it by some kind of subtle subterfuge which merely deluded and injured himself rather than aided his purpose. At the same time, therefore, that he was persuading himself that he was baffling and outwitting his opponents, he was merely by slow degrees losing his reputation and his authority. But for this fatal flaw in his character the chances were not altogether against him. Even if imprudent, had he been strong he might have gone far towards the attainment of his purpose. His actual discomfiture proved indeed so difficult, the balance between triumph and defeat was long so evenly suspended, that had he unflinchingly and energetically faced his difficulties without any subterfuge or evasion, he might have easily baffled parliamentary and Puritan ambitions, and certainly he might have done so had he been only a little wiser and abler than he was; while, again, nothing could have been better fitted, sooner or later, to ensure a catastrophe than the union of bold

assertiveness and sinuous manœuvring which he chose to regard as masterly statesmanship.

“The start of first performance,” says Bacon, “is all”; and if there be any truth in the aphorism, Charles, from the beginning of his reign, and even before he formally succeeded his father, was particularly unfortunate. He made a very bad start. He was the reverse of benefited by the mentorship of the vain and presumptuous Buckingham. At first it might have seemed otherwise. The rupture of the Spanish marriage negotiations elevated him for the time being into a kind of national hero; and when he and Buckingham arrived in England without the Infanta, they were in their passage through London received with clamorous enthusiasm. Then their zeal on behalf of the Protestant Palatinate won the special favour of the Parliament, and when, posing as the opponents of the king’s Spanish predilections, they proceeded, on a trumped-up charge, to impeach the king’s treasurer, Middlesex, their popularity was at its height. But, as the more shrewd and wary old king recognised, they were bound to pay dear enough for their ungrateful and flaunting confederation with the Parliament. He proved himself a true prophet indeed when, as Clarendon relates, he exclaimed, “By God, Stenny [his familiar name for Buckingham], you are a fool, and will shortly repent this folly, and you will find that in this fit of popularity you are making a rod with which you will be scourged yourself.” And still more striking was his anticipation of the fate of Charles himself, when, “turning in some anger,” he told him that “he would live to have his belly full of parliamentary impeachments; and when I shall be dead you will have too much cause to remember how much you have contributed to the weakening of the crown by the two precedents you are so fond of, intending as well the engagement of the

Parliament in the war as the prosecution of the Earl of Middlesex."

On his accession to the throne, 27th March 1625, Charles was still in the enjoyment of a large measure of his peculiarly earned popularity. Being largely accidental, it was necessarily fleeting; and much of the guilt was removed from it by his marriage to Henrietta Maria, who landed at Dover on 12th June, and, after being met next day by Charles, reached London with him on the 16th in the royal barge, amid salvos from the guns of the Tower and shouts of welcome from crowded ships and boats, and thronging spectators on the river's banks. Of these outward manifestations of joyous loyalty we have authentic record; but nothing has been directly told us of the secret fears, misgivings and antipathies of a large portion of the silent nation. To say the least, it was a strangely incongruous arrangement that while English Catholics were under the ban of the law, the young king should choose to inaugurate his reign by marriage to a Catholic princess. It was hardly an auspicious start; and, as matter of fact, the connection tended more and more to exasperate and estrange especially the Puritans, and to involve Charles in a cloud of distrust and suspicion as to the genuineness of his Protestantism.

Nor was it to have advantages sufficient to atone, even faintly, for its manifest detriments. When things came to the worst with Charles it did not prove to him a guarantee of salvation. Indeed from the very beginning it failed to be of any benefit to him. It did nothing to advance the purpose which he and Buckingham had primarily in view when they entered into negotiations for it. To recover the Valteline, France desired to hamper and impede Spain by the hostility of England; but she could not be expected to contribute to the success of a continental Protestant war. Her

refusal to permit the English force for the Palatinate, under Mansfield, to pass through France was, therefore, threatening the English expedition with failure; her active co-operation with the English fleet against Spain was unobtainable; and so far as concerned the Palatinate's recovery, Charles and Buckingham had failed as completely with her as they had failed with Spain. Had they succeeded in obtaining the active support of France on behalf of the Palatinate, then the reign of Charles would have made at least a fairly good start; the relation between him and the Parliament would have had even a seemingly auspicious inauguration. His early entanglement in a conflict with the Commons would have been avoided, and Protestant alarm at the marriage would have been allayed by what might seem its immediate Protestant benefits. But since it in no degree changed the situation as regards the Palatinate, it became completely discounted in Protestant eyes of its only recommendation, and instead of a source of security and power to the king became transformed into a heavy handicap to the possibility of a successful reign. It must be reckoned amongst the more potent of the direct agencies that wrought for his undoing. Indeed, had he married a Protestant, it is hardly possible that the opposition to him could have gathered such force as it did.

Directly, his marriage to Henrietta Maria did not however greatly affect, in an injurious way, the policy of Charles; and when the crisis came she proved a source of strength rather than weakness to him. Her personal malign influence on the fortunes of the dynasty, though it was to be great, manifested itself mainly after his death in the case of his sons and the descendants of James VII. and II. Meanwhile, from their first meeting until the death of Buckingham, her relations with Charles remained strained and unhappy.

On first seeing him she evidently took a strong dislike to him. Their temperaments were at variance. His punctilious and cold formality, his lack of genial ease and of emotional warmth disconcerted and fretted her. Her vivacity and sprightliness were largely lost on him, and she felt herself in a manner crushed and oppressed. Had she been quite happy and at her ease, she would hardly have resented so badly as she did his in any case tactless insistence that Madame de St George, her governess, was not of rank high enough to retain her place beside her in the carriage of the state procession. But the insistence and her violent offence at it were equally characteristic. If he was stiff and formal, she was passionately self-willed and easily roused to anger. "The queen," wrote a Mr Mordaunt to Rev. Joseph Mead, "however little of stature, is of spirit, and seems of more than ordinary resolution. With one frown, diverse of us being at Whitehall to see her being at dinner, and the room somewhat overheated with the fire and company, she drove us all out of the chamber. I suppose none but a queen could have cast such a scowl."

Then Charles deemed that the failure of France to aid him in the Palatinate absolved him of his secret promise to protect the Catholics. Henrietta had even hoped to procure his conversion; but she soon ceased to look for this, and became full of discontent and anger at her hampered religious situation. According to the painful letter of Charles, 22nd July 1626, she had scarce used him two days together with the respect due to a husband; and she put no restraint on her Catholic predilections. For instance, while at Titchfield, during her husband's absence, she entered the guard-room with her French ladies during the Protestant services, and purposely indulged in loud talking and laughing. With more reason she refused, on account of the Protestant

ceremony, to be crowned with her husband; but she manifested an ill-advised contumacy in declining even to witness his coronation. The climax was reached by her performance of devotion for the Catholic martyrs at Tyburn. This caused the king to send to France the bulk of her attendants, whom he supposed to be "the cause and fomentors of her humour." A violent outbreak of anger followed on her part, and the dismissed servants made an effort to resist; but their excitement was, in the end, partly allayed by expensive presents. After the death of Buckingham, of whose influence with the king she had been extremely jealous, she, however, gradually got to understand her husband. His good qualities—his inherent nobility of character, notwithstanding superficial defects, his utter devotion to what he deemed his duty, his sincere piety, Protestant and not Catholic though it was in form, and his inward steadfastness to his convictions, though she did not altogether share them—in the end secured him her respect and affection, while, as the stronger nature, she succeeded not only in fascinating him, but in exercising over him a remarkable sway except as regards his ecclesiastical predilections. To these he was to be faithful

"Midst all the shocks and injuries of fortune."

The French marriage being ineffectual in securing French aid for the Palatinate, Charles now found himself in difficulties with the Parliament. As his father had warned him, it soon became manifest how much he had contributed to the weakening of the crown by engaging Parliament in the war. But for the war, the Parliament could not have wrung from him the concessions he was induced to make, concessions which rather complicated than solved the constitutional problem. It might not even have occurred to them to vote the

customs duties of "tonnage and poundage," merely for a year, and not, as had been the case with all his predecessors, for life. Then, in the midst of his financial difficulties, he allowed himself to rouse the prejudices of the Commons by his interposition on behalf of Richard Montague, rector of Standford Rivers, who had been committed to the custody of the serjeant-at-arms on account of his tractate *Appello Cæsarem*. But meanwhile it was round Buckingham that the wrath of the Commons became concentrated. As James predicted, he was now being scourged by the rod which he himself had made. His haughty assertiveness had made him many enemies; it was known that he was mainly responsible for the French marriage; and it was believed that the king was largely under his domination. On the disastrous failure of the Cadiz Expedition, the Parliament, which met on 6th February 1626, proceeded to impeach him; and it was through his resolve, at all hazards, both to go on with the war and to protect and patronise Buckingham, that Charles was induced to take the first fatal step towards the curtailment of his sovereignty. It was merely vain for him to carry on the war and contend with the Parliament; and it was also equally vain for him without French aid to continue his efforts on behalf of the Palatinate; but instead of recognising these patent if unpleasant facts, he now permitted himself to become involved in a more comprehensive, if less confused, war policy than ever. On 31st April 1626, France came to terms with Spain; and as a consequence of a dispute about maritime trade between Spain and Flanders under the French flag, he speedily involved himself in active hostilities with France. Followed the inglorious expedition of Buckingham to the Isle of Ré for the relief of the Huguenots in Rochelle; and, resolved on an expedition on a larger scale in the following spring, Charles

summoned a new Parliament for 17th March 1628. This was all mere fatuity and worse; and the Commons took advantage of it by voting the large subsidies he asked for, on his agreeing to the stipulations of the Petition of Right, a cardinal clause of which was "that no man, hereafter, be compelled to make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or such like charge without common consent of Parliament," with a corollary against arbitrary imprisonment.

Charles sought to make a stand on his own right to imprison; but having obtained from the judges the opinion that he was not altogether precluded from imprisoning without showing cause, he, on 7th June 1628, announced his assent to the Petition. Having won this tactical advantage, the Commons now proceeded with their remonstrances against "grievances in church and state," including the king's countenance of Arminianism, and the continuance of Buckingham in his "great office"; and they further asserted that assent to the Petition of Right implied their right to decide as to the grant of "tonnage and poundage." The king had meanwhile, however, got his subsidies; and learning that they were preparing a second remonstrance, he, on 26th June, prorogued the Parliament; and before it reassembled Buckingham was at Portsmouth, struck to the heart with the knife of Felton.

Had Buckingham survived, difficulties might have thickened round the king more rapidly than they did; but he lived long enough to begin the entanglement, in his efforts to escape from which Charles succeeded in only more deeply ensnaring himself. Buckingham's removal revealed to the Commons that they had in Charles as obstinate an opponent to their ambitions as they deemed Buckingham to have been. Charles went on asserting his right to "tonnage and poundage" for

life; and the Parliament of 1629 immediately proceeded to question the legality of the prosecutions for non-payment of it; while a special Declaration in regard to the Montague dispute aroused its peculiar wrath.

The Declaration was meant to be conciliatory. A proclamation was issued calling in Montague's *Apello Cæsarem*; and Charles proposed that the doctrinal disputes between Arminianism and Calvinism should be buried in oblivion; but he asserted his right to the headship of the Church, and affirmed that ecclesiastical disputes were to be settled in Convocation "under his direction and in accordance with the laws and customs of the land." The great ecclesiastical dispute which was to wreck his fortunes had thus suddenly commenced. It was not properly a new dispute; it was only a new and more virulent manifestation of an old one which had troubled, more or less, both Elizabeth and James I. The slumbering embers were there, Charles by his interposition on behalf of Montague had fanned them into flame; and by awkward attempts to damp down the conflagration he but incited it into a brighter blaze. His proposal to consign the dispute between Arminianism and Calvinism to oblivion proved provocative instead of conciliatory, for it was the settled conviction of the Puritans that Calvinism was synonymous with Christianity, and Arminianism a deadly and diabolic negation of it; and again, when he decreed that ecclesiastical disputes were to be settled by Convocation under his direction, the Commons knew that this meant the doom of Puritanism. They thus had no alternative but to maintain that they and not the king or Convocation under his authority were the parties to determine the character of the nation's belief and worship. Constitutionally they were hopelessly in the wrong; but the late Mr Gardiner has advanced the theory that the blame of the quarrel rests primarily on

Charles and his father, because, instead of preserving a strict impartiality, they sided with one particular party. How impartiality could have been preserved he does not state; but he contrasts their conduct with that of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, who, he tells us, though they "had made use of the bishops as their instruments in Convocation, with scant respect of any objections that might reach them from the House of Commons," yet allowed it to be plainly seen that in so doing "they were not wedded to any particular party." Now the notorious fact in regard to Henry VIII. was that he forced his own ecclesiasticism upon the nation, while Elizabeth, again, showed herself more decidedly averse to Puritanism than to Catholicism. She persecuted the Puritans and sectaries without scruple, and turned as deaf an ear as did James or Charles to their clamour against the formularies of the Church of England. Charles, in fact, could not escape being an ecclesiastical partisan, though he was not bound to be an extreme or imprudent one. Moreover, with the progress of years the difficulties of the ecclesiastical situation had immensely augmented. Their augmentation was involved in the development of Protestantism. In the time of Henry VIII. the great Puritan movement had no existence, and not until the close of Elizabeth's reign was it to prove a formidable menace to the throne; but the menace, even if it was aggravated, was not created either by James or Charles.

As under James, so under Charles, the main quarrel with the Commons was an ecclesiastical one. Had he and the Commons seen eye to eye in ecclesiastical matters, the constitutional discord and the consequent difficulty about taxation could hardly have become so extreme as it did; but the ecclesiastical quarrel being so acute, no constitutional compromise or truce seemed possible on their part or his. An abler, more resolute

and more prudent sovereign than Charles might have retained his sovereignty; but whether he did so by assenting or not to their ecclesiastical demands, he could have retained it only as an absolute, not as a constitutional sovereign. Constitutional sovereignty in Britain was then a mere impossibility. Had Charles succumbed socially, ecclesiastically and constitutionally to the Puritan Parliament, the general confusion in Britain would have been more confounded than it turned out to be during the short Puritan triumph. Again, his successful sovereignty through resistance to the Parliament and the Puritans—by no means an impossibility but for his fatal faculty of mismanagement—was far from a desirable consummation, for neither is absolutism nor the tyranny of any form of ecclesiasticism desirable. The absolutism of Charles would also have been a greater misfortune to England than that of Cromwell turned out to be, since its results could not have been so easily undone, for he represented a time-honoured dynasty, and an institution venerable and sacred by its immemorial associations with the past; while Cromwell, an obscure yeoman, who had conquered the King and the Commons, represented merely himself.

But the tragedy of the situation was that no proper success was meanwhile on any terms possible. As the successor of Charles in supreme authority, Cromwell was to find himself in an even more formidable ecclesiastical dilemma than Charles had been; and he deemed it needful to assume a more arbitrary absolutism, and to support it by expedients legally more indefensible. His career as a ruler developed into a curious parody of that of Charles—a parody with all the more questionable features enormously exaggerated. Like Charles, he deemed himself in the possession of a special supreme authority by a kind of divine right;

for though he did not believe in the original divine right of kings, he professed to have a special commission from Heaven, as he whom the wonderful guidings of Providence had made the chosen head of "God's people now called saints." Obsessed with this conviction, he quite out-Charlesed Charles in lording it over the Commons, and did such varied and ruthless despite to that time-honoured institution as Charles never dreamt of doing. The ecclesiastical ideal of Charles was a national Ceremonial Episcopacy; that of Cromwell was a national conglomeration of sectaries, the repression of Protestant Episcopacy and Ceremonialism—including even the Book of Common Prayer—as well as Catholicism, and the limitation, so far as expediency would permit, of Presbyterianism, as tending to interfere with certain forms of Christian individualism. If he had wider conceptions of religious liberty than Charles, they were yet rather amorphous. His sympathies were noble, but they were circumscribed by the narrowness of his culture and the ecclesiastical peculiarities of his time: his ideas of toleration were less developed than those of Milton, whose Biblical Puritanism was quaintly blended with the Humanist influences of the Pagan classics. But Milton's ideas of toleration have not even yet been quite realised in Britain; and those of Cromwell, such as they were, could not be realised in his time, except through the persecution of probably the majority of the nation; for the truth is that civil and religious liberty is a gift, which, in its highest form, is very difficult of attainment. It can neither be conferred on a nation by compulsion, nor can it be snatched by mere violence; it is only as it becomes worthy of it that a nation could even be benefited by such a gift.

The break between Charles and the Commons origin-

ated in their attempts (1) to dictate to him his ecclesiastical policy, and (2) to complete his reduction to financial impotency by making the right to levy "tonnage and poundage" dependent on their annual consent. To frustrate this, he, on their assembling on 2nd March, after a short adjournment, declared his pleasure that they should again adjourn. This led to violent scenes between the House and the Speaker, who affirmed that he had no option but to obey the royal command; and when the Usher of the Black Rod was knocking at the door, Denzil Holles, who, with another member, had compelled the Speaker to remain in the chair, moved the hostile resolutions, and putting them himself to the House, declared them carried. They were as follows: "(1) Whosoever shall bring in innovations in religion, or by favour seek to extend Popery or Arminianism, or other opinions disagreeing from the true and orthodox Church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this kingdom and the commonwealth. (2) Whosoever shall counsel or advise the taking and levying of the subsidies of tonnage and poundage not being granted by Parliament, or shall be an actor or instrument therein, shall be likewise reputed an innovator in the government and a capital enemy to this kingdom and commonwealth. (3) If any merchant or any person whatsoever shall voluntarily yield or pay the said subsidies of tonnage and poundage, not being granted by Parliament, he shall likewise be reputed a betrayer of the liberty of England, and an enemy to the same."

Having decided meanwhile to dispense with the assistance of the Parliament, Charles made peace with France and Spain; but his attempts through negotiations to serve the cause of his Palatinate relatives proved abortive. The advantages of a peaceful policy almost, however, counterbalanced the evil effects of his

quarrel with the Commons, and the exceptional expedients to which he had recourse to raise money. "During the whole time," writes Clarendon, "that these pressures were exercised, and these new and extraordinary ways were run, that is, from the dissolution of the Parliament in the fourth year to the beginning of this Parliament, which was about twelve years, this kingdom and all his Majesty's dominions enjoyed the greatest calm and the fullest measure of felicity that any people in any age for so long together had been blessed with: to the wonder and envy of all other parts of Christendom."

Had Charles not—after failing in a will-o'-the-wisp project for bribing Spain on behalf of the Palatinate by a naval alliance against the Dutch—sought to gratify his self-esteem by asserting supremacy at sea, the political situation would not have become so rapidly critical. The main foreign danger, that from piratical raids, was provided for by the issue of writs to the ports and maritime counties "to maintain a portion of shipping for the safe-guard of the narrow seas." But when writs were issued for a national contribution for the support of a great navy, precedent was violated in two important respects: on the ground that he needed large ships, Charles proposed to supply them himself, and to commute the old obligation to a money tax; and what was still more alarming, to extend the tax to the inland counties. The tax raised general discontent. Even villages and hundreds but faintly tinged with Puritanism, began to be very punctilious about the relative amounts they had to pay; and in the more Puritan districts open resistance began to manifest itself. Thereupon Charles had recourse to the opinion of the judges, who declared that "as where the benefit doth more particularly redound to the port or maritime parts, as in the case of piracy

or depredation on the seas, that the charge hath been and may lawfully be imposed upon them according to precedent of former times; so where the good and safety of the kingdom in general is concerned, and the whole kingdom in danger—of which his Majesty is the only judge—then the charge of the defence ought to be borne by all the kingdom in general.”

The judgment was not expressed in quite convincing terms; and even if good law it did not ratify the king's action. Of imminent national danger he affirmed nothing: what he proposed was the maintenance of a permanent navy of his own by means of a permanent and universal tax. But, even if perfectly legal, the tax would have been unwise, for the reason that it was so unprecedented that he could inspire no belief in its legality. “The danger and mischief,” says Clarendon, “cannot be expressed that the Crown and State sustained by the deserved reproach and infamy that attached to the judges being made use of in this and other acts of power.”

Other modes of taxation he had resort to were far from so disputable as ship-money. In levying tonnage and poundage in defiance of the Commons, he was levying only what custom had made a permanent perquisite of the sovereign; and in other cases—the knighthood fines, fines for encroaching on the ancient boundaries and the revival of monopolies—there was a kind of precedent and more than a semblance of law on his side. But a universal ship-money tax was an innovation quite startling in its magnitude; and the injurious effect of its imposition was aggravated by the increasing use for political and ecclesiastical repression of such special tribunals as the Council of the North, the Court of High Commission, and the Star Chamber. All this tended to give plausible

ground for the accusation that he was seeking to overthrow the constitution and outwit the law.

Of recourse to the special tribunals there would have been less need but for the too eager ceremonial zeal of Charles and Laud, though, as Clarendon states, Abbot "left his successor a very difficult task to form and reduce the Church into order that had been so long neglected, and that was so ill filled by many weak and more wilful churchmen." But whether, as Clarendon supposed, had Abbot's predecessor Bancroft survived, he "would quickly have extinguished all that fire in England which had been kindled in Geneva," Laud was not the man to extinguish it. If his ceremonial reforms were merely the revival of customs which under the loose rule of Abbot had been allowed to lapse, his zeal in promoting them rather outran his discretion. To say the least, he was too much of a mere ecclesiastical martinet. For the preservation of religious reverence, ceremonial might be an important help, but a religious reverence mainly dependent on ceremonial was necessarily bound to be more a superstitious than an enlightened reverence; and if "unity of observance" was, as Laud said, necessary to prevent the Reformed Church from "being broken into fragments," the too rigorous compulsion of this unity might also have the same effect. On the other hand, his discouragement of doctrinal discussion as a primary cause of dispeace and schism, while it secured some liberty of private opinion within a certain circumscribed area, tended at the same time, in co-operation with excessive ceremonial, to supersede thought in the sphere of religion by mere blind emotional routine.

The Puritan, again, looked on ceremonial with grave suspicion as closely allied to Popish "idolatry," and relied mainly on definite Calvinistic dogmas and

oratorical appeals to the mind and heart. Laudism, with its elaborate ceremonial, its much broader social outlook than Puritanism and its less dogmatic tendency, was a partial attempt to restrain the Protestant development and its possible political consequences. It was an attempt at a realisation of the ideal of James I. It sought to impose on the nation an organisation very similar to that of Rome, except that a special infallibility, a special supremacy, in Church and State was claimed by the king instead of by the Pope. To Charles its main recommendation was the provision of new bulwarks to the tottering mediæval sovereignty, and of an antidote against the disintegration foreshadowed by undiluted Protestantism. Its promise turned out to be delusive, though the bubble would not have burst so quickly but for its too forcibly rapid inflation. Laud, Clarendon tells us, never studied the easiest way to his ends, and even his downright sincerity was against him; for by applying the discipline of the church "to the greatest and most splendid transgressors as well as to the punishment of smaller offences and mean offenders," he necessarily made many powerful enemies. While the most irreconcilable and dangerous antagonist of Charles and Laud was Puritanism, it was thus finding support in its political antagonism from amongst those who were outside its own pale, including even those who might be reckoned the least religious. It was becoming a kind of political cave of Adullam for all who were in distress, or for any reason discontented, whether from antipathy to law or from jealousy of the king's attempt to tamper with it.

Yet the gathering hostility to the policy of Laud and Charles in England might not have swept them from power, had they not rashly opened on themselves the floodgates of Scottish indignation. Though the Five

Articles of Perth had aroused deep discontent, it had been partly allayed by the promise of James to the Parliament of 1621, that if the Articles were passed he would not press for further innovation. In 1626 Charles also gave instructions that those of the clergy ordained before the sanction of the Articles should be excused from compliance with them, but that compliance should be required of all ordained, or to be ordained, subsequent to this,—an arrangement that tended to secure compliance with the minimum of friction. The Act of Revocation—annexing to the church and crown all lands alienated since the accession of Queen Mary in 1542 — by improving the monetary position of the clergy, helped also to mitigate the winter of their ecclesiastical discontent. On the other hand, while the Revocation Act favoured the clergy, it aroused bitter exasperation among the greater and lesser barons; and the alienation of the nobility and gentry was further augmented by the reintroduction of the bishops into positions of secular dignity. Besides being made President of the Exchequer, Archbishop Spottiswoode was assigned precedence before any other subject of the kingdom; five bishops were included in the Privy Council, and bishops preponderated on the committees of the Lords of the Articles. This display of the old Stewart partiality for ecclesiastics as counsellors tended to alienate many of the nobles who had been the chief buttress of James VI.

If it was too much to expect that the varied Scottish discontent would at once have been “made glorious summer” by the visit of Charles to Scotland for his coronation in 1633, the occasion might have helped not a little to temper animosities by purely patriotic feelings, but for the additional ecclesiastical irritation it was made the means of producing. To the holy

horror of the Edinburgh burgesses, it was, however, observed that the officiating bishops, instead of being robed in the altogether sombre gowns of Calvinism, were apparelled in piebald Anglican fashion, with "white rochets and white sleeves, with hoops of gold, having blue silk to their feet," and that in the chapel an altar had been set up with a gorgeous crucifix behind it, in passing which the bishops were seen, idolatrously, to bow and beck. As if this was not enough, the Bishop of Moray, formerly "one of the town's Puritan ministers," on the Sunday following, preached in St Giles before the king, clad in his rochet, which rag of Popery, as they deemed it, had not since the Reformation been flaunted in the ancient kirk, hallowed in their memories by the idolatry denunciations of the Great Reformer. Then, in October, followed an order that the bishops should array themselves in white rochets, and the inferior clergy in surplices.

All this added to the smouldering discontent, and helped it to blaze into unquenchable flame when there was applied the final provocation of a liturgy. On this matter neither General Assembly, Parliament, nor Privy Council was consulted. The liturgy was prepared by the Scottish bishops, aided, or rather directed, by Laud. Laud affirmed that the time and manner of the introduction of the canons and liturgy were left by him solely to the Scottish bishops, "who do, or should, understand both their church and their laws." If Laud, however, was passive, Charles was not; and it looked as if Scotland, without leave asked, was being appropriated by the ecclesiastical province of Canterbury.

The application of the spark happened on 23rd July 1637, when the Dean of Edinburgh in the kirk of St Giles—lately erected into the cathedral of the new diocese of Edinburgh—began the service according to

the forms of the new Prayer Book. Whether the first voice and weapon raised against the mummery were those of the humble stall-woman, whom a later pamphleteer terms "the immortal Jenet Geddes," is a question that may remain open; but all agree that the chief participants in the fray were of "the bangster amazon kind." The shrill uproar rendering it impossible for the dean to make his voice heard, the bishop stepped into the pulpit and appealed to them to reverence the sanctities of the place; but his presence only augmented the uproar, stools, bibles, and other weapons being, with abusive epithets, hurled at him from all directions. During the following week no bishop dared show himself in the street; and the continuance of the liturgical services in the city churches became a sheer impossibility. Week by week, also, the anti-Prayer Book agitation became more formidable; and, in the words of Clarendon, "all the kingdom flocked to Edinburgh, as in a general cause that concerned their salvation."

From Charles a true glimpse of the realities of the situation was concealed by the haze of officialdom. The magistrates, the bishops, the Privy Council and others in whom he put his trust, were all, for one reason or another, disposed to minimise the potency of the opposition to his wishes. Moreover, he was fully convinced not only of the goodness and wisdom of his intentions but of the divinity of his spiritual commission—as convinced as the Pope, or the Mulla, or the Lama of Thibet. As their supreme spiritual guide, he therefore issued to the Scots a proclamation condoning their past offences, and, while taking full responsibility for the introduction of the Prayer Book, assuring them that it would be "the ready means to maintain the true religion already professed, and to beat out all superstition." But his assurance only

redoubled the indignation at his high-handed interference; and if the clergy were not better justified than he in assuming that they were the divinely appointed trustees of what they termed the "crown rights of Christ," their revolt against such an undisguised attempt to reduce them to a condition of mere ecclesiastical serfdom is hardly to be wondered at. They and their supporters formed themselves into four Tables or Committees—a kind of informal Parliament, composed respectively of nobles, gentry, burgesses, and clergy—who chose a permanent commission to deal with the crisis; and it was determined to prepare a National Covenant, binding the subscribers to uphold, to the utmost of their power, "the true Reformed government and worship," and to resist to the death all innovations tending to subvert it.

Says Burns—

"The Solemn League and Covenant
Now brings a smile, now brings a tear."

The real issues involved were hardly so momentous as either party supposed; and the decorous submission of the present congregation of the gaudily refurbished St Giles—now, in accordance with the decree of this same Charles I., termed a cathedral—to the service in vogue there, may well provoke a smile at the immense commotion caused by the liturgical ukase of the seventeenth century. Yet the mead of a tear can hardly be withheld when we call to mind the long tale of suffering which this contest about shadows was to create. To the first couplet of the Burns epigram it is thus easy to subscribe. Assent is more difficult to the third line—

"But sacred freedom too was theirs."

True, it would be unfair to "sneer" at them; for

a large majority of them were perfectly sincere, just as Charles I. was perfectly sincere, but "sacred freedom," alas! was neither his nor theirs. The tragedy was created by the fact that neither he nor they properly understood what "sacred freedom" meant. If Charles sought to sacrifice "sacred freedom" on the shrine of sovereignty, the Covenanters were bent on sacrificing it on the shrine of the Covenant. So completely did they become obsessed by the Covenant, that they strove to impose it on Great Britain and Ireland as the only true test of genuine Christianity.

How, in face of this tremendous outburst of opposition, was Charles to enforce his ukase? With a united England he might have done so, just as his two sons were cruelly to do so; but already the Puritan leaders there were turning their eyes to the Scottish hills as the region from whence might come their aid. Not yet aware of the full stringency of his dilemma, Charles resolved on coercion; but having no means of effecting this, he sent as commissioner to them the Marquis of Hamilton, who was to flatter them with what hopes he pleased, the "chief purpose being now to save time," that they might "not commit public follies" before he should be able to suppress them. When, however, they declared that should the king delay to call an Assembly, they would call one themselves, he issued a proclamation, actually abrogating the service-book, discharging the book of canons, abolishing the Court of High Commission, declaring the Articles of Perth to be optional, making the bishops subject to synodal censure, and indicting a General Assembly to be held at Glasgow on 2nd November and a Parliament at Edinburgh on 5th May. This was all very well. It might even have effected a reconciliation but for the sting in the tail of the proclamation: the past was to be remitted to all who should sign what came to be known as the King's

Covenant. This while, like the National Covenant, embodying the Confession of Faith of 1580, substituted for the new clauses of the National Covenant the band of 1589, "touching the maintenance of True Religion and the king's person and estate."

This attempt of the king to take the wind out of the sails of the Covenanters only provoked their implacable resentment. It was, in their opinion, merely to add insult and something worse to injury. It was—so in their inevitable Biblical symbolism they put it—like asking them "to subscribe the Old Testament without the New, by the will of the Jewish magistrate." The fate of his proposals in the forthcoming Assembly could not be doubted. It was to be a "Free Assembly," but by this the Covenanters meant one representing only their opinions. Lukewarm subscribing, as well as non-subscribing, clergy were excluded. To this packed Assembly Charles sent the Marquis of Hamilton as his commissioner; but when it began its proceedings by asserting its right to put the bishops on their trial, Hamilton, in the king's name, dissolved it. In defiance of his veto it then remained in session and carried out its programme, by sweeping away all royal innovations and re-establishing the Kirk after the original Reformation ideal.

Its defiance of the king was uncompromising and complete; and measures had already been taken to render the defiance effectual. Taking time by the forelock, they had elected as general the "old crooked soldier," Alexander Leslie, a field-marshal of the great Gustavus. To Leslie the proudest nobles gave themselves over to be guided as "if he had been great Solyman." Arms and ammunition had been collected; numerous Scottish veterans had returned from abroad; and Scottish officers of Continental experience had for months been diligently drilling enthusiastic recruits

throughout the country. Then followed the complete failure of the plans of Charles to cope with the emergency; the encampment of the motley Covenanting host, 5th June 1639, on Dunse Law, to bar the further progress of his very indifferent and heterogeneous levies; and his second meek and weak compromise, on 18th June, by the pacification of Berwick, the terms of which were in effect a mere postponement of the evil day.

While declining to ratify the Acts of the Glasgow Assembly, Charles declared it to be his pleasure that all ecclesiastical matters should be determined by General Assemblies and all civil matters by Parliament; and appointed an Assembly to meet at Aberdeen on 16th August, to be followed by a Parliament on the 20th. This Assembly not only renewed, in substance, the drastic enactments of the previous one, but induced the Privy Council to pass an Act making subscription of the National Covenant compulsory on the whole nation; and yet Charles ratified the proceedings, contenting himself with declining to admit that Episcopacy was in itself unlawful or to rescind any Act of Parliament made in its favour,—thus converting its abolition into a mere temporary arrangement of the Assembly.

There being no bishops to have a seat in the Parliament, a new arrangement had to be made for the Lords of the Articles; and it was carried that each Estate should choose its own lords. This was, in effect, a constitutional revolution; for besides giving the barons and burgesses preponderance over the nobles, it nullified the king's control in the choice of matters for Parliamentary decision. Moreover, the Parliament would be one in which the power of the nobles would be swamped by the middle classes, who were under the domination of the clergy; and both civil and ecclesi-

astical authority would gradually centre in the Assembly of the Kirk. An organised Presbyterian despotism was thus suddenly created, with subscription to the National Covenant as an essential of citizenship.

Such was the baleful apparition now confronting Charles in Scotland. Unless also he was able speedily to lay or daunt it, the English spectre was certain soon to show its horrid front; and, again, the possible raising of the English spectre stood in the way of laying the Scottish one. Fate thus already had him in an almost mastering grasp: the Scottish difficulty was to drag him deeper into the morass of the English one until he was overwhelmed.

While in ecclesiastical affairs placing an absolute trust in Laud, Charles, since the death of Buckingham, had had no political counsellor but his wife; but feeling himself now hard beset, he had resort to Lord Wentworth, whose rule in Ireland had meanwhile been a splendid success. Wentworth had opposed the foreign adventures of Buckingham, and he had vainly striven to wean Charles from his Palatinate delusions. He had also sought to mediate between him and the Commons by a Habeas Corpus Act that would meet the necessities of the case on the parts of both. But as the constitutional dispute began to widen, his sympathies veered more and more towards the king. "A man," as Clarendon states, "of great parts and extraordinary endowments by nature," nobly patriotic and courageous and supremely resourceful, he might well, had he been king, have saved the situation. But, alas! Charles sought his counsel only at the eleventh hour, and when he got it he did not consistently abide by it. Thus his policy now represented a disastrous amalgam of Wentworth's boldness and his own ineffective temporising, of Wentworth's discerning compromise, hampered by his own unwise pertinacity. Wentworth,

now created Earl of Strafford, advised the experiment of summoning an English Parliament, and meanwhile succeeded in obtaining from the Irish Parliament a grant of four subsidies providing for a reinforcement of 9000 men. But in the English Parliament another temper prevailed. Largely swayed by Pym, the Commons came to the conclusion that "till the liberty of the House and kingdom were cleared, they knew not whether they had to give or no." They also proposed a conference with the Lords, but Strafford anticipated them by securing from the Lords a resolution that Supply should be granted before the consideration of grievances. This the Commons voted a breach of privilege; and, to conciliate them, the king now, on the advice of Strafford, offered to resign his right to levy ship-money; but instead of, as Strafford advised, putting the question of the amount of subsidies "upon their affection," he insisted on twelve subsidies. Having thus an opportunity for haggling, they insisted on being eased of the current military charges and on the discontinuance of Laud's "innovations in religion"; but they did not expect their terms to be accepted. Already they were in friendly communication with the rebel Scots commissioners; and Pym now arranged that the Declaration of the Scots should be read to the House, with a view of proposing that a petition should be drawn up recommending the king to come to terms with them. This the king frustrated by immediately dissolving the Parliament. He had now no option but, as Strafford advised, to have recourse to any means he thought fit to raise money. This, however, proved a hard task. An effort to rate the London citizens for a loan was thwarted by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen; an endeavour to obtain one from Spain also failed, and expedients at home aroused discontent among many who had no sympathy with the Scots.

Led astray by Lord Savile, who forged the signatures of certain peers to a communication guaranteeing armed assistance, "the blue bonnets," on 20th August 1640, "went over the Border," crossing the Tweed near Coldstream, to the number of 25,000, under the veteran Leslie. The old plundering instincts that might still linger in the breasts of some were strictly repressed. Towards their "auld enemies" they assumed an attitude of almost heavenly benevolence, "publishing," says Carlyle, "boundless brotherly Declarations to all who loved Christ's Gospel and God's Justice in England." As of old, each man had on his back a small haversack of oatmeal; but they had also some herds of cattle and sheep, and some supply of money for the purchase of provisions.

Since they had really no guarantee of armed support, their expedition was more hazardous than they supposed; but they were greatly favoured by the king's lack of promptitude. Strafford was to go to Ireland for reinforcements; but time pressed, and at the last moment he had to take command in England. Illness detained him in York, and the blundering of Lord Conway with the advanced forces at the passage of the Tyne led to the rout of Newburn and the abandonment of Newcastle. As Strafford wrote with regard to his own command, "never man came to so lost a business."

After advancing to Durham and the line of the Tees, the Scots decided to await developments in the South. The hoped-for armed assistance was not forthcoming; but a petition, drawn up by Pym and St John and signed by twelve peers, was presented to the king, requesting him to summon a Free Parliament in order that the abettors and counsellors of their grievances might be brought to trial and negotiations opened up for peace with the Scots. Thereupon, at a great

Council of the Peers, which met at York on 24th September, the king agreed to summon a Parliament for 3rd November, they providing the means for the maintenance of the army. The peers agreed to appeal to the city for a loan of £200,000 on their security, but insisted on negotiations with the Scots. On their commencement at Ripon, on 2nd October, the Scots claimed maintenance for their army at the rate of £850 a-day. The Lords left the decision of the point to Charles; and Strafford advised that, at all hazards, he should refuse their request. By already spoiling the Episcopalians in Durham they had aroused much ill-will, and he pointed out that further plundering would rapidly change the indifferent attitude of many in England into bitter hostility. Moreover, mere respect for his sovereign dignity should have compelled Charles to refuse; and, besides, of the ordeal his opponents were preparing for him he had full warning; no concealment of their purpose was made either by the Scots or their English confederates; and the snare being thus set before his eyes, Charles, as if fascinated by its weird spell, walked helplessly into it.

CHAPTER X.

CHARLES I.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRAGEDY.

THE Parliament — which was to make for itself a repute quite unique in English history — began its adventurous career by depriving Charles of Strafford. That Charles should have passively submitted to the impeachment and trial of his chief coadjutor, merely for his devoted services to himself, was deplorable enough. Still he had assured him that, whatever the verdict might be, he would not permit him to suffer “in life, honour, or fortune”; and had he even interposed to save him from death, he would have made some amends for his original lack of self-respecting resolution. But in certain circumstances indecision inevitably leads to, if it does not imply, demoralisation. Unmanned by an apprehension, probably not of mob violence, though there were rumours of this possibility, but of dethronement—which would, as he said, affect beside himself, “my wife, children, and all my kingdom,” — he abased himself to assent to Strafford’s execution. The dishonour of his compliance is merely emphasised by the matchless magnanimity of Strafford in expressing his perfect willingness to sacrifice himself for the good of Charles and the State, “so that his death might free the kingdom from the many troubles that it apprehended.” In the end Charles

recognised the enormity of his pusillanimity, and his remorse became a haunting and characteristic superstition. He was accustomed to trace his subsequent ill-fortunes to the just punishment by God of "that base, sinful concession concerning the Earl of Strafford": that they could be traceable either to his own mistaken aims or his lack of ability to attain them, he never for a moment dreamed. But with this exceptional confidence in his cause and in himself, he yet shrank from critical emergencies. He was an autocrat rather by conscientious conviction than by temperament. Though narrowly bigoted, he much preferred conciliation to coercion. He was always hoping to

"Smooth the frowns of war with peaceful looks,"

but yet he never ceased to combine imprudent provocation with his sham conciliation.

If the new Parliament had resolved on the ruin of Strafford, it was not to be expected that Laud—whom the Scots were denouncing as a "raging tyrant and bloodthirsty wolf"—would escape its sinister attentions. On 18th December he was impeached, and on 16th February fourteen articles of impeachment were brought against him; but it was deemed sufficient, and evidently more convenient, to shut him up in the Tower an untried prisoner; and he was not brought to trial until 1644, when Charles was not in a position to extend to him the pardon he had withheld from Strafford. Other prominent abettors of the king, as Finch and Windebanke, saved themselves by flight to the Continent.

If Charles vaguely hoped that Strafford would be deemed his scapegoat he was soon deceived. But his demoralisation did not cease with the sacrifice of Strafford. So befooled had he become, that he, at

the same time, actually agreed not to dissolve the present Parliament without its own consent. This, if in some respects not so despicable a concession as assent to Strafford's execution, was a more fatal one. It, rather than the death of Strafford, was to be the main source of his future woes. By it he virtually denuded himself of sovereignty: he abolished the constitution, and made possible the Civil War and the subsequent dictatorship of Cromwell.

Once they had, by this monstrous compact, induced Charles to let his hands be securely tied, the Commons proceeded to strip him of everything by which he could make a show of sovereignty. The Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission were abolished; the levy of ship-money and knighthood fees was made illegal; the forest claims of the Crown were strictly limited; and Charles not only undertook not to levy tonnage and poundage beyond 15th July, but had to renounce his claims to any kind of customs and duties without the consent of Parliament. Finally, he obtained no assistance against the Scots. On the contrary, he, on 10th August 1641, assented to a treaty with them which confirmed all the Acts of the Glasgow Assembly, and secured to them a grant of £22,000 in recognition of their "brotherly assistance" to the English Parliament against himself!

Yet, withal, the English ecclesiastical difficulty remained unsettled. It was the skeleton at the outwardly harmonious banquet, disquieting its felicity and prognosticating disaster. Riddance from it was an impossibility, for the Reformation had broken up the old religious or superstitious unanimity, and the king and the Commons were each now seeking to establish rival ecclesiastical unanimities. In the Commons the Puritan party were in a majority; but a minority of the party, inspired by Pym, were dis-

posed, for strategical reasons, to tolerate an Episcopacy with special checks on its ecclesiastical authority, and deprived of power in civil matters and of representation in the House of Lords. The Lords, however, as also a considerable number of the Commons, favoured Episcopacy without limitations; and their rejection of an Exclusion Bill caused those who were indifferent as to Episcopacy to coalesce with the anti-Episcopalians. A bill, known as the Root-and-Branch Bill, was therefore, on 27th May, read a second time in the House of Commons. In committee the abolition of deans and chapters, as well as bishops and archbishops, was carried; but no definite conclusion was arrived at as to what the new government should be. The majority of the Puritans favoured Presbyterianism, in which even Milton, with much too sanguine ardour, was disposed to see the possible means for the realisation of his own Christian ideals. But it was carried that, for the time being, ecclesiastical jurisdiction should be vested in nine lay commissioners, with power to appoint divines for the ordination of ministers. Still, the bill made but slow progress in committee. The Chairman — Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon — favoured Episcopacy; and the king told him that if he saw that it was not carried before he went to Scotland, he would “undertake for the Church after that time.” To which Hyde replied: “Why, then, by the Grace of God, it will not be in much danger.”

It is difficult to say what Charles expected from Scotland; but, like Micawber, he was always expecting something to turn up. Probably, having won over the Scottish commissioner Rothes, he was flattering himself that Rothes would be able to do much more for him than he could possibly have done had he survived; but before Charles left for Scotland, on

10th August, Rothes was taken ill and he died at Richmond on the 23rd. There is no proof that Charles was concerned in the mysterious Scottish plot of 12th October, termed "The Incident"; but while doing what he could to flatter, beguile and bribe the Covenantee leaders, he secretly encouraged the formation of an anti-Covenantee party under Montrose, who, partly from distrust of Argyll, had now joined the Royalists. Charles could not in the end prevent Argyll and the Covenantee leaders from casting in their lot with the English Puritans; but certain Royalist possibilities were created which were to have no small influence on the country's future, and to break up the old Covenantee unanimity.

Hardly, however, had Charles set out for Scotland when the English Parliament—which, be it remembered, could not be dissolved—began to put the kingdom in what was termed "a state of defence," *i.e.*, against the king. Holland, who succeeded Northumberland as general, and had shown signs of disaffection to the king, was ordered to secure Hull with the military stores collected there for the now disbanded army, while special means were taken to secure the Tower and its munitions. Meanwhile the Root-and-Branch Bill was suspended, and the remaining days of the parliamentary session were given over to a series of squabbles in the Commons and between them and the Lords about ecclesiastical observances.

On the assembling of Parliament, on 28th October, the Root-and-Branch Bill was not proceeded with; but a second Exclusion Bill was sent up to the Lords, with the outrageous request that the bishops, as the parties concerned, should not be allowed to vote on the question. Another step towards rebellion was then taken when the Commons resolved

to draw up a remonstrance—known as “The Grand Remonstrance”—on the state of the kingdom; and before the labours on the document were well begun, the Puritan agitation received additional stimulus from the massacre of Protestant settlers in Ireland. For the outbreak some would assign all the responsibility to Strafford’s policy of “thorough,” but it may well have been caused by the widespread Catholic alarm at the triumph of the Puritan party in England. While, also, Charles was credited with having incited it as part of a great plot against both English and Irish Protestantism, it was in reality a great embarrassment to him.

Meanwhile Pym, recognising the danger of putting troops in the hands of the king for any purpose, unscrupulously opposed the granting of aid to him, lest the forces should be employed “to the fomenting and cherishing of it there, and encouraging some sudden attempts of the Papists and ill-affected subjects in England”; and meanwhile it was resolved to bring the quarrel with him to an issue by hurrying on the preparation of the Remonstrance. A typically flamboyant party manifesto, it was momentous (1) in being both addressed to and directed against the king, and (2) in being meant not to appeal to the constituencies—they had ceased to be recognised,—but to inflame the nation, and especially London. It concluded with a twofold epilogue: (1) Charles was required, in future, to employ only “such persons in great and public offices as the Parliament should have cause to confide in”; and (2) to effect the needed reformation in the Church, and “a conformity to that order which the law enjoins according to the Word of God,” a synod of divines was to be called, “assisted with some from foreign parts professing the same religion with us, who should represent the result

unto the Parliament, to be then allowed and confirmed and receive the stamp of authority."

Many even of Pym's supporters shrank from such an uncompromising committal of themselves against the king; and to prevent the spread of indecision the debate was brought to a close at a single sitting. Begun at nine in the morning it was continued until twelve at midnight, when the Remonstrance was carried by 159 to 148. On the minority being refused the right of protestation, swords were drawn, and, but for the suggestion of Hampden to adjourn the discussion until next meeting, there might have been a bloody encounter on the floor of the House. As, the church of St Margaret's then striking two, the excited members were trooping out into the cool morning air, "Falkland," so writes Clarendon, "asked Oliver Cromwell 'Whether there had been a debate.' To which he answered, 'He would take his word another time,' and whispered in his ear, with some asseveration, that 'if the Remonstrance had been rejected, he would have sold all he had the next morning, and never been in England more.'"

On 25th November—three days after the Remonstrance had passed the Commons—the king arrived in London from Scotland. He was "royally feasted" at the Guildhall; and as he passed with torchlight along the city streets to Whitehall, an "infinite acclamation of joy" rent the air. It was the last loyal reception he was to meet with in London; and had he properly recognised the now almost desperate character of his position, it might well have sounded to him like hollow mockery. On 1st December a deputation from the Commons waited on him with the Remonstrance, when Sir Ralph Hopton read to him the boldly offensive document. That the Commons should ever have dreamed of presenting to him such

a string of insults shows how utterly they had begun to despise him; and in fact he had yielded so much that he might well be expected, with sufficient pressure, to yield almost anything. His reception of the deputation might also well have confirmed them in this belief. He had no gift of passionate indignation; and after a mere protestation against the assertion that there was about him a "malignant" party "with a design to change religion," he stated that he would give "an answer to their business with as much speed as the weight thereof will permit." Before receiving the answer the Commons, on 15th December, published the document. Notwithstanding this, he sent the answer to them on the 23rd. It was as courteous as the document was the reverse; perfectly plausible, and from their point of view quite unsatisfactory. He justly stated that he was as opposed as the Commons to "the designs of the Popish party"; he could not give an answer about the bishops' vote in the Lords until his concurrence was asked in a parliamentary way; though persuaded that no Church on earth "professed the true religion with more purity of doctrine than the Church of England doth," he was willing to call a National Synod to inquire into "such ceremonies as gave just cause of offence to any"; he was prepared to exercise every care to elect as counsellors and ministers only those "against whom there can be no right of exception"; and finally, he exhorted them "to give such expedition to the work of suppressing the Irish rebellion as the nature thereof and the pressure in point of time may require."

Another source of mischief was now created by the conduct of the mob round Westminster and Whitehall. Twelve bishops, including the Archbishop of York, on this account protested that as they could not venture

to sit and vote in the House of Lords, all votes passed during their compulsory absence must be deemed null and void; and thereupon the Commons annihilated the value of their protest by committing them to the Tower. This was succeeded by a quite different but much graver *contretemps*. A rumour having reached Charles of the intention of the Commons to impeach the queen, he, on 3rd January 1642, directed the Attorney-General to impeach of treason five members of the Commons—Pym, Hampden, Holles, Haslerig, and Strode, and one peer, Lord Kimbleton, afterwards Earl of Manchester. When the serjeant-at-law appeared in the Commons to demand that the five members should be delivered up, they appointed a committee to inform the king that they would give the demand, which concerned their privileges, full consideration, assuring him at the same time that the members named would be ready to answer if accused legally. This was certainly reasonable; but Charles had now lost his head, and instigated, it is said, by his wife's angry taunts, he determined, accompanied by a band of armed followers, to enter the House of Commons and demand their immediate surrender. What would have happened had they been present baffles conjecture; but the queen had vauntingly whispered the secret of her husband's great resolve to Lady Carlisle, who informed Lord Essex; and when Charles made his dramatic appearance in the House, it was only to discover that, as he put it, "the birds were flown." They had fled to the city. Next day Charles went thither to demand, but in vain, their deliverance; and the Commons, before adjourning until the 11th, appointed a committee—virtually of the whole House—to sit at the Guildhall, under the protection of the city. On the 11th the accused members, "attended with thirty or forty long boats, with guns, flags," &c., proceeded up the river to Westminster, where the

Commons sat under the protection of the city trained bands.

The king, who on the previous day had left Whitehall for Hampton Court, now sought to back out of his difficulty by actually asking the advice of the Commons as to whether he was at liberty to proceed against the members by impeachment or to prefer an indictment at common law in the usual way; and the Commons had no scruples in advising him in their own favour. Their view of the law was "that no member of Parliament can be proceeded against without the sanction of Parliament"; and they therefore desired to be informed of the proofs against the accused members, that "they might be brought to a legal trial." Completely checkmated, Charles preposterously announced that he was now "willing to grant as full and generous a pardon as might be convenient for that purpose"; whereupon the Commons, scorning a pardon to persons not found guilty, impeached the Attorney-General for acting at the instance of the king, and sent him to prison. As regards the future, the damaging consequences to the king of the affair, which had apparently such a futile ending, may probably be reckoned next to the execution of Strafford and the grant of a perpetual lease of life to the Commons. It immensely increased the contempt for his authority entertained by the Commons, and by greatly damaging his reputation in London, it proportionately strengthened the position of the Commons there.

An ordinance was now passed "for placing the militia under the command of persons in whom Parliament could confide"; and now that the bishops were in the Tower, the Lords were induced by 36 to 23 to pass the Exclusion Bill. On the queen's suggestion the king gave his assent to it, and he also offered various minor

concessions, besides assenting to the Impressment Bill for Ireland. But he was now beginning to see the futility of "his old game of yielding everything"; and besides, he could not yield on the ecclesiastical question.

Shortly after leaving Whitehall, Charles, having appointed the Earl of Newcastle governor of Hull, had sent Captain Legg to take charge of it; but his purpose was betrayed to the Commons, who immediately placed it under the charge of Sir John Hotham. On 23rd February the queen set sail from Dover, and three days thereafter Charles came to Greenwich; and after sending for the Prince of Wales he proceeded northwards, arriving at York on 16th March. From Holland the queen urged him to decisive action. "You must," she wrote, "have Hull, and if this man who is in it does not submit, you have already declared him a traitor: you must have him alive or dead, for this is no longer mere play."

Charles now proposed to place the militia in the hands of those nominated by Parliament, provided they received their commissions from him and were removable when he saw fit, whereupon the Commons took upon them to appoint new lord-lieutenants with authority to command the militia. This brought matters to a bearing. To a member of a parliamentary deputation, who suggested that he might grant the militia for a time, he replied with unusual emphasis, "By God, not for an hour"; and he met their appointment of new lord-lieutenants by affirming the appointments to be invalid without his consent. This the Commons audaciously declared to be a "high breach of the privileges of Parliament"; and on 8th June, they defined their position in nineteen propositions, which, if accepted, would have made the office of sovereign a mere super-

fluous sinecure, and have established in its place a parliamentary absolutism without appeal to the constituencies.

Primarily, however, the cause of the deadlock was not political. Unlike the French Revolution, the Puritan uprising was not the delirious outbreak of a nation maddened by the varied cruelties and sufferings inflicted by a relentless despotism; nor, like the American Independence movement, was it a revolt against the foolish dictation of another portion of the empire. It differed from both in that it was the mere defection of a party which, even at the acme of its triumph, represented a mere minority of the nation. The main source of the mischief was the brawl between the two Protestant factions. At the same time, many who rallied to the rival standards were not actuated mainly, if at all, by religious or ecclesiastical motives. The religious and social reforms for which many of the Commons sighed were not of a character to command the enthusiasm of the great mass of the people. There was even a striking incongruity between the excessive religiosity of the Commons' malcontents and the lack of religious fervour in the majority of those who took up arms on their behalf. Being both needy and in love with rebellion, the most lawless and disorderly classes now flocked to the Puritan standard. According to Cromwell, the original parliamentary troopers were mainly such "base and mean fellows" as "decayed serving-men, tapsters, and such like"; and the armies of Essex were recruited largely from the blackguards of the towns. As for those who now began to join Charles in the north, their main motive was loyalty to the sovereign, a sentiment which, amongst the jovial, sporting, non-Puritanic squires and their retainers, survived in almost its primeval vigour.

The decisive advantage of the present Parliament

over all previous ones lay in the fact that it could not be dissolved nor even prorogued. This had already given it an enormous leverage, and the manner in which the king had already yielded to it had inspired it with almost boundless confidence. But while there was a pretty strong sentiment against the king in London and other towns, it could hardly be said that the nation generally had been seething, as in Scotland, with political or ecclesiastical excitement. The king's main lack, at first, was money and munitions. But for this, many more might have been enlisted on his side. With the munitions of Hull and the Tower, the command of the navy, and the possession of London, the Parliamentary rebels were confident of immediate triumph. And they were specially confident of this, because they had quite misjudged the king. He had so invariably yielded to them that they seem to have scouted even the bare possibility of his making any strong stand against them. But as yet they only half understood him. Of his stubborn tenacity and indomitable courage, when subterfuge could no longer serve him, they had no conception. "We all thought," says Richard Baxter, "that one battle would decide it." It did not even occur to them that the king might not regard the loss of his first battle as decisive; still less had they anticipation of the possibility of so prolonged and difficult a struggle as that which was before them; and yet more were they astray as to the period, the long generations, that would elapse before any lasting decision would be arrived at, and as to the character which that ultimate decision would assume.

On 22nd August 1642, Charles set up his standard at Nottingham, in the presence of less than 1000 followers, but by the middle of September about 10,000 had rallied to his support, mainly the nobility and gentry with their dependants. Threatened by Essex

with a greatly more numerous force, he retired towards Shrewsbury, and after obtaining 4000 recruits on the Welsh borders, began his march southwards. On reaching Edgecot, he found Essex to be in his rear, at Kington, seven miles north-west; and on Sunday the 23rd, he moved west towards Edgehill. Though his artillery was still behind him, Essex drew up in battle formation in the "vale of the red horse," about two miles from the foot of the hill. Each of the armies numbered about 14,000; but while the Royalist cavalry was 4000 to the 3000 of Essex, it was also superior in quality, and led by the dashing Prince Rupert of the Palatinate. The battle began with a Royalist cavalry charge down the slope on the two cavalry wings of the enemy; and it proved irresistible. Had Rupert then wheeled round and charged the centre, one battle might have "decided it," not for but against the Commons, and London in a few days been in the king's hands; but with Rupert in reckless pursuit of the fugitive horse, the enemy's infantry, as darkness began to fall, compelled the king's foot to retire up the hill. Since Essex was disabled by the rout of his cavalry, Charles might, with promptitude, have seized London; but he permitted Essex, now in retreat, to reach London before him; and after reconnoitring round the city, he retired to Oxford. Still, a heavy blow had been dealt to the confidence of the Commons; and it was soon supplemented by successes of importance by Sir Ralph Hopton in Devon and Cornwall, and the Earl of Newcastle in Yorkshire.

After the depleted House of Lords had, on 3rd January 1642-3, passed a bill for the abolition of Episcopacy, negotiations were, on 1st February, begun at Oxford for a cessation of arms; but since the Commons added to, rather than abated, their old demands, "only He who made the world out of nothing

could," to quote a private comment of the king, "draw peace from such articles"; and the futile discussion closed, on 14th April, with the king's ultimatum for the delivery into his hands of the magazines, ships, and forts, the permission of the excluded members to return, and the Parliament's removal to some place not less than twenty miles from London.

The rebels now made overtures to the queen—probably with the design of luring her into some glaring indiscretion. In a letter to the king she said she thought it "fitting to show a desire for peace"; but her attitude did not satisfy the Commons, for, on 23rd May, she was impeached by Pym at the bar of the Lords. A procedure so arrogant was far from warranted by the military situation, though it might well be provoked by the queen's energetic action on her husband's behalf. The supplies of money and munitions sent by her—including £100,000 from the Prince of Orange—had immensely improved his prospects; and her arrival in the north of England in the end of February had given a great impetus to the royal cause. Her eagerness and energy, and her womanly influence, put new heart into the Royalists, and a rapid series of successes followed. Before she left to join the king—who met her at Edgehill on 13th July—Lord Fairfax had taken refuge in Hull; and with its exception, all Yorkshire was in the hands of Newcastle. With her arrival at Oxford with 5000 men the king's position there became secure; and in the west the annihilation of Waller's army by Hopton and Lord Wilmot at Roundway Down, on 13th July, followed on the 26th by the storming of Bristol, made the Royalist cause as supreme as in Yorkshire. The main key of the position was London. Could it be secured, the power of the Parliament would collapse. The vital question was whether attack on it should be delayed until the cap-

ture of Hull and the important seaport of Plymouth. It was delayed when a rapid concentration on it might have been decisive. Indeed, so disheartened were now the rebels that a proposal to accept the king's ultimatum of 7th April was accepted by the Lords, and only by a small majority rejected by the Commons.

Time was also more precious than Charles imagined. Already two great elements of danger were at work which were to turn the balance of fate against him. The one was Cromwell, now in the Eastern counties drilling his Ironsides and learning his military apprenticeship; the other was the Scots, to whom the rebels were now driven to apply for help. The terms on which they obtained it were for some of them hard, humiliating, and even discreditable. They had to bind themselves—which they did, on 25th September, by a Solemn League and Covenant—to extend Presbyterianism over England and Ireland, and bring all the churches of the three kingdoms to “uniformity in religion, confession of faith, and form of church government.” Already, on 17th June, a bill had been passed for calling an Assembly of Divines for the reform of the Church of England, which, on 1st July, had begun its sittings at Westminster; and to this assembly was, under the superintendence of the Puritan Parliament, now committed the larger task of framing a system of belief, a form of discipline and government, and a directory for the proposed organisation. Its realisation was to be frustrated by the unscrupulous interposition of Cromwell; and thus the deliberations of the Westminster Assembly left but a faint impression on English life; but though England escaped the domination of its Confession of Faith and its Larger and Shorter Catechism, they are still, nominally, the standards of doctrinal belief in the Church of Scotland and other Presbyterian Churches there.

Equally hard in their worldly bargaining, the Scots demanded payment for their army at the rate of £30,000 a month. This being conceded, a force under Leslie of 18,000 foot and 3000 horse, on 19th January 1644, crossed the Tweed on the ice and marched through the snow towards Newcastle. Charles previously engaged in the siege of Gloucester, had, on the arrival of Essex, with a force of 15,000, raised the siege and placed himself in a position to fall on him on his way to London; but at Newbury, on 20th September, Essex, in a greatly battered condition, cut his way through; and Charles, for lack of ammunition, retired to Oxford. In the east, Cromwell, on 11th October, obtained a notable victory at Winceby in Lincolnshire; and in the north, Newcastle on the 12th raised the siege of Hull and retired to York. Later, in the south, the advance of Hopton was checked by his defeat, on 29th March, at Cheriton, near Alresford.

The chance of a combined movement on London had thus passed away; and while the Scots paralysed the north, a junction was imminent between them and the Eastern Association. On 15th March the queen expressed to Newcastle her apprehension that should they pass the Tees all would be lost; and Newcastle had to shut himself up in York, where he was besieged by a combined force of Scots under Leslie, and of Parliamentarians under Fairfax and Cromwell. The approach of Rupert from Lancashire with 20,000 men compelled them to raise the siege; and then followed in the summer evening of July 2nd the battle of Marston Moor, when, after the defeat of the Parliamentary left wing by the impetuous Rupert, the fortunes of the day were turned by the overwhelming charge of Cromwell's and Leslie's horse. Shortly after, York surrendered, and Newcastle withdrew in despair to France. Rupert, with a fraction of his beaten forces, retired to Lanca-

shire; the Scots set siege to Newcastle-on-Tyne; and the Fairfaxes made themselves masters of Yorkshire; but Manchester, in chief command in Lincolnshire, remained inactive, uneasy at Cromwell's increasing repute, and his favour for the sectaries: and "always for such a peace as a thorough victory would be a disadvantage to."

Meanwhile the queen left Oxford for Exeter, Charles, on 12th April, convoying her to Abingdon, where they parted for ever. After giving birth to a daughter, she, on 13th July, owing to an agonising rheumatic affection, set sail from Falmouth for France. Charles having stolen out of Oxford—threatened by Essex and Waller—towards Worcester, Essex proceeded to the southwest, leaving Waller to keep watch on the king, who after revisiting Oxford for reinforcements, turned on Waller, and after defeating him, 29th June, at Copredy Bridge, set out against Essex. Driving him towards Fowey peninsula, he hemmed him in; and though on the night of 1st September the horse of Essex broke through, the infantry capitulated, Essex and a few officers escaping by sea.

On his way back Charles, on 27th October, was attacked by Manchester, reinforced by rallied troops under Essex and Waller; but in an elevated position under the shelter of Donnington Castle, he repelled the attack until nightfall permitted retreat to Oxford; and later he brought off his artillery.

The failure of Manchester caused Cromwell to accuse him of being "backward to engagements, and the ending of the war by the sword"; and on 19th December a "self-denying ordinance" was passed, excluding members of both Houses from military or civil offices or commands; and the army was also to be organised on a "new model." While numbering only 22,000 it was carefully selected; and the cavalry

included Cromwell's Ironsides. The "ordinance" being, on 11th January, rejected by the Lords, the Commons virtually superseded Manchester and Essex by appointing Sir Thomas Fairfax commander-in-chief; and on the 25th Fairfax's list of officers was sent up to the Lords along with a new "self-denying ordinance"—that members of both Houses holding offices or commands should resign them within forty days,—which was passed on 3rd April. Meanwhile as Cromwell's men showed themselves greatly hurt on learning that he was not to accompany them to the west, he was directed, for the time being, to retain his command.

While the Puritan army was being reorganised the fate of Laud was decided. After a long and vain attempt to make good the charge of treason, the Commons, on 31st October 1644, dropped the impeachment for an ordinance of attainder, which was passed by the Lords on 4th January, and on the 10th the travesty of justice was completed by his execution on Tower Hill.

In the midst of these proceedings the rebels, on 23rd November, handed to the king at Oxford certain high-handed proposals as a basis of a treaty of peace. What he knew of their dealings with Laud, what he afterwards thought of his execution, is unrecorded; but he went through the form of offering a limited Episcopacy, a certain amount of freedom in matters of ceremony, and a kind of compromise on the question of the militia. But in the eyes of the Parliament his proposals were as preposterous as their haughty demands were in his; and the conference at Uxbridge, which began on 29th January 1645, broke up on 22nd February without agreement on a single article.

On 7th May the king—while Cromwell was diverted by an incursion of Goring's horse—made his way out of Oxford, and, joined by Rupert, proceeded to the relief

of Chester; but learning, as he neared the city, that the siege had been raised, he turned south, and on 31st May, after a desperate resistance stormed Leicester, taking 1500 prisoners, a large number of horse and immense supplies of munitions and provisions. This caused Fairfax to raise the siege of Oxford; and Cromwell, who had gone to secure the Isle of Ely, was recalled to command the horse. The battle of Naseby on 14th June was a kind of repetition of that of Edgehill; but Rupert's rashness in the pursuit was here more heavily punished. This was because, though he did not know it, the enemy outnumbered the Royalists by 14,000 to 7500, and because he had Cromwell, as at Marston Moor, to deal with. Few of the infantry escaped death or capture. The cavalry dispersed in various directions. Charles, after reaching Leicester, left it the same evening with a few followers for Wales. All the artillery and baggage fell into the enemy's hands, including the king's cabinet of papers with their damaging revelations of his negotiations for foreign aid. In Wales Charles succeeded in mustering a small force; and on Rupert, who was at Bristol, pointing out that his case was hopeless, he replied that while, humanly speaking, it might be so, he was convinced that God would not suffer his cause to be overthrown. When, later, he learned that Rupert—though on terms permitting him to march out with arms, baggage, and ammunition—had surrendered Bristol, he dismissed him from his service.

With 3000 horse Charles, in August, set out to join Montrose, whose meteoric career of victories in Scotland had greatly dumfounded the Scottish army in England. Finding, however, that the passage at Ferry Bridge was held by a strong force under General Poyntz, he turned south for a raid in the Eastern counties, and on the 24th captured Huntingdon with much booty. On

the 28th he returned to Oxford, and on the 31st he set out for the west, but chagrined by the surrender of Bristol he turned back. Collecting contingents from various garrisons, which brought up his forces to 5000, he set out for Chester, near which, on 25th September, after a successful attack on General Poyntz at Rowton, he was assailed in the rear, during the pursuit, by troops from the garrison, and almost surrounded. After recruiting his forces in Wales he now made a rapid dash towards Newark, but on the approach of Poyntz went back to Oxford, reaching it on 6th October.

Never again was he to have a chance of taking the field. In Scotland his hopes of retrieval perished in the mists of Philiphaugh, when, on the morning of 13th September, Montrose was surprised and overwhelmed by David Leslie with 5000 horse from the Scottish army in England. News now also reached him of the surrender of castles in all directions, and so far as fighting was concerned, his cause was evidently lost. Probably had he shown the same unflinching resolution as a king that had enabled him to comport himself so well as a soldier, it would not have been lost. Success was now and again almost within his reach; the scale was turned against him by the Scottish reinforcements and the genius of Cromwell. If not a great general, his promptitude in emergencies had led to some brilliant successes; and in his attempts to retrieve his overwhelming calamities he showed a daring pertinacity. Now left only with the weapons of negotiation, he retained his calm self-possession, and strove as resolutely, and almost as hopefully, for victory as ever.

Additional prejudice against him had been produced by the publication of the documents found at Naseby, as well as Glamorgan's agreement as to concessions to the Irish Catholic clergy on condition of receiving Irish and Catholic aid. The apprehensions they aroused were

mistaken ones. He was but striving to utilise the Catholics for the special benefit of himself and Protestant Episcopacy. As he wrote to his wife, what Glamorgan had done was directly against his conscience, "which," he said, "when I shall forfeit by giving up the Church of England to either Papists or Presbyterians, I must not expect to be esteemed by honest men or (what is worse) ever to enjoy God's favour." But since Glamorgan had misconceived his finer subtleties, it is small wonder that his attitude towards Catholicism was misunderstood both by Puritans and Episcopalians. Nor was it strange that his negotiations with the Catholics should fail. What comfort could the Catholics find in such plausibilities as, "I will take away all the penal laws against the Catholics as soon as God will enable me to do it," or how could he expect the Pope and the Catholics "visibly and heartily" to "engage themselves for the establishment of the Church of England, and" his "crown against all opponents whatsoever"?

His schemes to circumvent his Protestant opponents were not, on the face of them, so hopeless. At first he thought of going to London; but this the queen strongly opposed; and with her consent Monteruel, the French agent, began negotiations with the Scots on his behalf. To this the king himself was no party. Why, he asked, should Monteruel go there, "since he knows they will do nothing for me"? She suggested they might do much if he could grant them Presbyterianism. But while to her and Monteruel one form of Protestantism was as good or as bad as another, it was otherwise with the king: "for the Presbyterian government," he wrote, "I hold it absolutely unlawful." Still he was willing to be "instructed" in Presbyterian government, and to satisfy the Scots so far as his "conscience would permit." Monteruel was given to understand

that, on these conditions, the king would be received into the Scottish camp with "freedom of his conscience and honour," though when Monteruel went to Newark, he found the Scots in such a humour that he advised Charles not to risk coming to them. Still, though resolved not to commit themselves in writing, and even prepared to deny, both to the English Parliament and Charles, that they had been treating with him, the Scots were clearly scheming to entice him to come. Monteruel, again, being anxious to prevent him going to London, was disposed to place the most favourable interpretation he could on their attitude. As for Charles, he was between the devil and the deep sea. As Oxford was about to be invested, he had to choose, without delay, between the Scots or the Parliament or flight to the Continent. At midnight of 27th April he left the city in disguise undecided what to do; but on receiving at Harborough certain assurances from the Scots through Monteruel, he joined a party of soldiers under David Leslie, who conducted him to the camp at Newark, and after its surrender, at his request, he accompanied the Scottish army to Newcastle.

He found himself merely entrapped: he was "barbarously baited" to sign the Covenant, to declare unreservedly for Presbyterianism, and to receive the Directory into his family with "an absolute command for the rest of the kingdom." Failing this, the Scots declared they would make an agreement with the Parliament "without regard of him." In conjunction with the Scottish commission the Parliament, on 11th July, completed Propositions for his subscription of the Solemn League, for an Act enjoining its subscription by all the subjects of the three kingdoms, for the disqualification for any kind of office of all who had been in arms against the Parliament, and for the exemption from pardon of practically all the nobles

and gentry who had been his supporters. To this uncompromising document he, on August 8th, sent a reply, proposing that for greater convenience in the negotiations he should come to London, or any of his houses thereabouts, upon security of "freedom, honour, and safety." This being rejected, he, on 20th December, renewed it, with assurances of his earnest desire to "condescend unto them in whatsoever shall be for their good and happiness." While convinced that his assent to the permanent establishment of Presbyterian government "would procure God's further wrath" upon him, he yet believed that without dire offence to the Almighty he might offer the establishment of Presbyterianism for three years—provided he meant this merely as an arrangement for securing the final establishment of Episcopacy; but as the more downright queen remarked, the subtlety was not likely "to do the feat." The Scots had been retaining him mainly as a hostage for their arrears of pay; and when, besides committing the Parliament, as they thought, to Presbyterianism, they succeeded in wringing from it an acknowledgment of indebtedness to the tune of £400,000, and receiving the half of it to account, they set out, on 30th January 1646-7, for Scotland, leaving Charles in the hands of the Parliamentary commissioners, who brought him to Holmsby House, Northamptonshire.

But while the Scots obtained the fulfilment of their pecuniary bargain, they failed in their ecclesiastical one. Their fond anticipation of a universal Presbyterianism was to be dissipated by the triumph of Cromwell and the Independents. The term Independent did not then connote, as it now does, a body of Christians, characterised by a substantial, though not compulsory, uniformity in religious belief and observance. It was a generic term for a great variety

of sects created by the ingenuous perusal of the Scriptures. Each sect could quote chapter and verse for its own distinctive verity or delusion, and there was thus developed a picturesque variety of moral and spiritual singularities. To those simple-minded and sincere zealots their own special "ism" was the supreme spiritual catholicon; and needing toleration for themselves, they were, for the time being, prepared to grant it to others. But Episcopacy was hateful to them, both as a kind of bastard Popery, and for its compulsory uniformity; and their yoke, they could not but see, would be still more grievous under Presbyterianism. During the progress of the Civil War the sectaries were unchecked, and they were now seen to be much more numerous than had been supposed. In the hope of toleration for their own particular nostrum, they latterly enlisted in such numbers as to form the backbone of the New Model army, which was largely officered by them. Amongst their more irreligious fellow-soldiers they also made many converts, and fired them with their own high zeal. By this armed host of separatists and schismatics the coming of Presbyterianism was viewed with growing uneasiness; and, on the departure of the Scots, with an increasing disposition to interfere. In direct violation of his solemn oath as a subscriber to the Covenant, Cromwell, in September 1644, had got a committee appointed to find out "some way how far tender consciences could be borne with according to the Word"; but the conundrum remained unsolved. The imminence, therefore, of a wrangle between the largely Presbyterian Parliament and the schismatic army, caused the king, prompted by encouragement from certain peers, to send a third answer to the Newcastle propositions, offering an experimental Presbyterianism for three years, and Parliamentary control

of the militia for ten. The letter was read to both Houses on 18th May 1645; but the statement of Gardiner (*Civil War*, iii. 70)—which largely colours his subsequent narrative—that it was at once accepted “as a basis for accommodation,” is a strange misconception. Later the House voted against a proposal of Cromwell for the three years’ limitation; and while on the 24th the Lords proposed that Oatlands should be prepared for the king’s reception, Belière, on 6th June, wrote that the House of Commons had not discussed the message, and were so badly disposed that he could do no more than avoid speaking about it.

The Commons proposed a large reduction of the army, the dismissal of all the general officers, except Fairfax, and the conformity of all officers to the Presbyterian Church; and when, on 27th May, an immediate and separate disbandment of the regiments was decreed, and it was known that the immediate establishment of Presbyterianism, if necessary by Scottish aid, was contemplated, the representatives of the soldiers induced General Fairfax to order a general rendezvous of the army on 4th June at Newmarket. There a solemn engagement was subscribed not to disband until security was obtained for the redress of their grievances. Any desire was disclaimed to interfere with the civil or the Presbyterian government, or to open the way for “licentious liberty under the pretence of obtaining ease for tender consciences.” Once the State has made a settlement, they rather dolefully remarked, “we have nothing to say but to submit or suffer”; but they had really no intention of permitting a settlement that would leave their position no better than before. Their advance towards London meant that they were not prepared either to submit or suffer. On 14th June they made such “humble requests” as that the House “might

speedily be purged" of such members as "for their delinquency," &c., ought not to sit there, that those who had been prominent "in their unjust and high proceedings against the army" might be made "incapable thereof in future," and that toleration be granted to those who upon "conscientious grounds differ from established forms," &c.

The army leaders, who on 3rd June had brought the King from Holmsby House, and on 24th August had placed him in Hampton Court, now made proposals to him for triennial Parliaments, Parliamentary control of the militia for ten years, the repeal of all Acts against the Book of Common Prayer, not coming to church, attending meetings elsewhere, and not taking the Covenant; the deprivation of the bishops of coercive power, &c.

Thus behind the back of the Parliament those who had signed the Solemn League for Presbyterian uniformity were seeking to substitute an Episcopal and ceremonial church, which no one would be compelled to attend, and with unlimited liberty for separatists to multiply and prosper. This was far from the ideal of Charles; but when in September the Parliament, in answer to his letter of 12th May, sent at last virtually a repetition of the Newcastle propositions, he stated that they were even "more disagreeable to the present condition of affairs than when they were formerly presented to him," and that having seen the proposals of the Army, he thought they might be "a better foundation for a lasting peace." He therefore proposed that joint commissioners from the Parliament and the Army should have conference with him on the matter.

This suggestion Parliament voted to be "a flat denial"; but Cromwell, by a large majority, induced them to go over their own propositions with a view

of seeing how far they could be amended. He failed to carry the proposal for a mere experimental Presbyterianism; but succeeded in obtaining indulgence for other than Presbyterian congregations to worship God on the Lord's day, the indulgence not, however, "to extend to toleration of Common Prayer in any place whatever."

Recognising that both Army and Parliament were against him, Charles resolved on flight. At 9 o'clock on the night of 11th November he escaped from Hampton Court by the back stairs to the river-side, and accompanied by Sir John Berkeley, Mr Ashburnham, and Mr Legge, rode southwards to Lord Southampton's house at Titchfield, whence, after Berkeley and Ashburnham had interviewed Colonel Hammond, governor of the Isle of Wight, he crossed over to it. At Hampton Court he left a letter, stating that he deemed it needful to seek his "safety by retiring himself for some time from the public view." His escape caused much consternation; but efforts to discover his whereabouts proved vain until the receipt, on the 15th, of a letter from Hammond announcing his arrival in the Isle of Wight. By the instructions of the Commons he was detained in Carisbrooke Castle, £5000 being sent for his present necessities. On the 17th he sent a letter to the Speaker of the Lords, refusing to consent to the abolition of archbishops and bishops, and renewing the proposal for an experimental Presbyterianism for three years. He also offered Parliamentary control of the militia for the remainder of his reign, and commended the Army proposals concerning the succession of Parliaments and elections. Finally, on 11th December, four bills were transmitted to him giving Parliament control of all the land and sea forces for twelve years, freeing the members from all penalties on account of their

proceedings in the late war, debarring any one hereafter created a peer from sitting and voting in Parliament without consent of both Houses, and assigning Parliament full control as to its adjournment. The revived Propositions already mentioned were also enclosed.

This caused Charles to conclude, 26th December, a secret agreement with the Scottish commissioners on the basis of the establishment of Presbyterianism for three years, with a provision for suppressing the opinions and practices of separatists and schismatics. Should the Parliament decline to disband the Army as a preliminary to an arrangement, the Scots were to issue a Declaration maintaining the king's power in the militia and his right of the negative voice in Parliament, and to send an army for his restoration. Next day he gave to the Parliamentary commissioners his reasons for rejecting the Bills and Propositions; and shortly after they left the island a project for his escape was discovered, and the guards doubled.

Parliament now resolved neither to send him nor receive from him any more addresses, and pronounced it treason for any one to have communication with him without leave from both Houses of Parliament. Meanwhile the government was vested in a committee of the two Houses, who were to "govern and defend the kingdom by their own power, and not teach the people any longer to expect safety and government from an obstinate man whose heart God had hardened." Thus the Cromwellian sectaries, after offering to agree to a limited Episcopacy, and against their solemn oath betray Presbyterianism, came to terms with the Presbyterians on obtaining, in opposition to that solemn oath, toleration for themselves. Both broke their solemn oath and their faith with the

Scots, by whose help they had been able to triumph over the king.

It was the support of only a portion of the Scots that Charles obtained. Though a majority in the Parliament were for war, many of the nation deemed it sacrilege to grant assistance to a non-covenanted king. Then certain risings in Wales and Kent were premature and easily dealt with; and the mismanagement of the Duke of Hamilton, the Scottish commander, led to the overwhelming triumph, 17-19th August, of Cromwell in Lancashire. Hamilton was marching southward in widely scattered divisions; and Cromwell, partly by extreme promptitude, partly by good luck—or, as he put it, by “the great hand of God in the business”—was able to attack him just as he had halted to collect his forces. Accomplished with great vigour and valour, Cromwell’s task was not essentially difficult. Though his highly-trained force was less than half the size of the other, he dealt his first crushing blow on a mere fraction of it, and thenceforth had to contend with a merely bewildered and demoralised crowd.

This three days’ series of engagements, known as the battle of Preston, placed for a time the destinies of the three kingdoms in the hands of the schismatics. A revolution was thus effected which has no parallel in history. The usurping Commons was superseded by the usurping Army, and the despised sectaries became masters of the country and the king. The transformation seemed akin to the miraculous. Well might Cromwell remark: “these were dispensations the like of which many generations cannot afford.” In his fallacious mystical fashion he opined that there must be some “glorious and high meaning in them”; and what he and “God’s people now called saints,” supposed them to mean was that Heaven desired them

to bring Charles to the block. Indeed, before they set out they had resolved that "if ever the Lord brought us back again in peace, to call Charles Stewart, that man of blood, to account for that blood that he has shed."

But the levelling principles of the Army were so scandalising and alarming the majority of the Parliament that, on 30th June 1648, it decided that the Acts "forbidding any addresses to be made to or received from his Majesty should be made null"; and shortly thereafter a series of negotiations with him were begun which terminated in the Treaty of Newport. The king agreed to Parliamentary control of the militia for twenty years, and to leave the settlement of Ireland to the determination of the two Houses; but he could not be induced to go beyond his former concessions of a limited Episcopacy or a Presbyterianism for three years. Privately he affirmed that having no hope of a satisfactory agreement, his aim in showing a willingness to grant concessions was to obtain a liberty that might facilitate his escape.

But his intentions and the Parliament's purposes were alike destined to be frustrated. On 20th November Fairfax presented to the Commons the Army's remonstrance against "any further proceedings" in the Treaty, and its demand that "the king should be brought to justice as the capital cause of all." On the 25th Charles stated that he "could not condescend further in the business of the Church bishops, bishops' lands," &c.; but the commissioners still waited, "expecting further answer," when Colonel Ewer, on the night of the 28th, surrounded the king's lodgings at Newport, and at daybreak informed him of his orders to remove him to Hurst Castle. Thereupon the Commons, on the 30th, refused to take the Army

remonstrance into consideration—payment of their arrears being, however, agreed to—and after a prolonged night debate, it was actually decided, by a majority of 46, “that his Majesty’s concessions to the Propositions of Parliament upon the Treaty are sufficient grounds for settling the peace of the kingdom.” But not thus was it to be settled; next morning the city train-bands were superseded as the guards of the Parliament by Colonel Rich’s regiment of horse, and Colonel Pride’s regiment of foot; and Colonel Pride carried out a purging process, which reduced what remained of the Parliament to a mere schismatic clique. The story of an effort of Cromwell by an interview with the king to win concessions that would save his life, is refuted by the renewal, on 13th December, of the resolution against communications with the king.

When the king on the 23rd arrived at Windsor, the Council of War decided that “all ceremonies of state to him should be left off,” and nothing done upon the knee; and on 1st January the skeleton Commons declared it high treason in the king to have levied war against the Parliament—the very Parliament which Colonel Pride, with their assent, had so ruthlessly mutilated! Further, when the Lords declined to agree to the king’s trial, this fractional House of Commons declared that they alone, *as representing the people of England*, had “the supreme authority of this nation,” and that “what they declared law had the force of law without the concurrence of the king and peers”; and then proceeded to bring in an ordinance for the king’s trial. As passed on 6th January 1649, it named 135 commissioners to form a court; but the majority, including Fairfax, declined to sit. On 19th January the king was brought from Windsor to St James’s; and next day the trial commenced at Westminster Hall.

The sectaries having the power of the sword at their disposal, could hardly be expected not to use it to secure liberty of conscience for themselves; and it is not surprising that they concluded that to gain this they had no option but to override the Parliament and execute the king. As Cromwell put it, the Army being "called by God to oppose and fight against the king," might "oppose one name of authority," *i.e.*, the Parliament, "for these ends as well as another name." But the awkward thing was, that they had been fighting the king on the Parliament's behalf and to secure its supremacy. Further, while they were now opposing the Parliament, they were actually professing to act in its name, and acting in its name, to *represent the people of England*, when they could not but know that they represented a mere fraction of the nation. Carlyle, in his oracular fashion, declared that the court sat "there as in the presence of the Maker of all men, as executing the judgment of Heaven." Well, it was the persuasion of each party—Charles, the Scots, the English Parliament, the Army—that they were specially entrusted with the purposes of Heaven, and the sequel was to show that each was more or less mistaken; but had the Cromwellians been content with what they evidently believed they had, the sanction of Heaven, they would have saved themselves from the series of wildly false pretences which immensely increased the general abhorrence of their procedure and greatly deepened the infamy in which for many generations their memory was involved.

Since Charles declined to acknowledge the "pretended jurisdiction" of the court, some proposed, without more ado, to pronounce sentence against him; but to satisfy the more punctilious, it was agreed to go over the evidence privately in the Painted Chamber. Undeniably he had been in arms against the Parlia-

ment, but equally so the Parliament had been in arms against him, and the Army, whose puppets were trying him, were in arms against the Parliament! After the formal evidence had been read in open court, it was agreed at a second private sederunt to condemn him as "a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and a public enemy to the commonwealth of England," and that the condemnation should extend to death. With this momentous judgment sixty-seven members of the court, on the 26th, signified agreement, and on the 27th the commissioners again assembled in Westminster Hall, the President, now robed in scarlet, to pass sentence. Charles—who was greeted with unseemly cries of "justice, execution"—desired to be heard before sentence was passed; and this was granted after the President, "in the name of the people of England," had addressed the public. Charles then made a request to be heard in the Painted Chamber before the Lords and Commons; but this was deemed a declinature of the jurisdiction of the court. His desire to say a few words after sentence was passed was also ignored; and he was removed, protesting, amidst a disgraceful exhibition of contumely, the soldiers as he passed down the stairs displaying their levelling enthusiasm by scoffing at him and blowing tobacco smoke in his face. But in his journey from Westminster to Whitehall there was evidence enough in the sorrowful aspect of the people of the lack of their approval of what was being done in their name.

The execution was fixed for 30th January. At the king's request, Dr Juxon, Bishop of London, was admitted to assist him in his devotions; and he was also allowed an interview with his children, of whom only the Duke of Gloucester and the Princess Elizabeth were in England. The touching details of his counsels and farewell to them need not here be recapitulated.

To prevent his rest being disturbed by the noise of the preparations, he was on the night before the execution brought to St James's. Thence he was summoned to Whitehall about ten in the morning. Since the season was sharp, he had dressed himself "in a shirt more than ordinary," lest an appearance of shivering on the scaffold might be mistaken for fear; and he was prompt to obey the summons, walking smartly through St James's Park between lines of foot soldiers, with colours flying and drums beating. About half-past one he stepped unconcernedly through the middle window of the banqueting house on to the black scaffold, surrounded on every side by grim companies of Puritan foot and horse. As Clarendon states, though "he was not enterprising," he was "very fearless in his person"; and he faced his doom with unruffled self-possession. Throughout the customary preliminaries he bore himself with calm and easy dignity; and to those in charge of the dread functions he displayed a pleasant and accommodating courtesy. In a quietly emphatic manner he addressed a short speech to the small company around him, in order to clear himself as "an honest man, a good king, and a good Christian." It was his happy predicament to be fully convinced—as convinced as Cromwell and the sectaries were of the opposite—that he was dying on behalf of "a good just cause." And as to why God permitted him to suffer, he could "only say this, that an unjust sentence" [meaning that of Strafford] "that I suffered to take effect is justified now by an unjust sentence upon me." He accepted his execution, therefore, as an expiation of this offence. As for the people, he desired their liberty and freedom as much as anybody, but this, he said, did not consist in having a share in the government, but in having "those laws by which their life and their goods be most their own."

Carlyle, in his picturesquely vehement manner, has pronounced that "the action of the English regicides did in effect strike a damp like death through the heart of flunkeyism in this world." To appraise the ancient sentiment of loyalty to the sovereign as mere flunkeyism seems a strange misrating of it, even if in the time of Charles, and more or less in some previous generations, it had an alloy of this. Nor can it be affirmed that Cromwell's sense of "public necessity" embraced more than the triumph of "God's people called saints"; and Carlyle is certainly wrong as to the kind of sensation produced by the execution. Philip Henry, as reported by his son, declared that "at the instant when the blow was given there was such a dismal universal groan amongst the thousands of the people that were within sight, as he never heard before and desired he might never hear the like again." This was not "a damp like death"; it was a kind of moaning execration. Whether the execution was a blunder or a blessing in disguise, there is testimony enough that it lacked the sanction no less of public opinion than of law. If Cromwell and his associates did render a priceless service to Britain in ridding it of the absolutism of Charles, they did it by a mere act of absolutism on their part, and they substituted for it an absolutism of their own. In this respect the execution of Charles differs widely even from that of Louis XVI. at the time of the French Revolution. The presumptive assent of the nation to it was a false and hypocritical pretence; and it was therefore in effect a mere assassination: it assumed in the eyes both of the English and Scottish nations the form of an enormous criminality perpetrated by a revolted army, and rendered only the more odious by the violent appropriation of a spurious national sanction. The influence of this sentiment on subsequent events it is hardly possible to over-estimate;

unless it is taken into consideration they become inexplicable.

The late Mr Gardiner, again, whilst almost as convinced as Carlyle that Cromwell could do no wrong, unlike Carlyle, shrinks from direct laudation of the execution; but he tells us that "even if those who opposed Charles in the late stages of his career failed to rally the majority of the people to their side, they were undoubtedly acting in accordance with a permanent national demand for that government by compromise which slowly but irresistibly developed itself in the course of the century." There is a certain ingenuity in this almost worthy of Charles himself. The "even if" is quite superfluous, for there is no doubt at all that the regicides were in a hopeless minority; and though Cromwell's ideas of compromise were in advance of those of Charles, he would permit no compromise in regard to Episcopacy, while the bulk of his associates were "levellers" who knew nothing of compromise. Such ideas of tolerance as they possessed were mainly self-directed, and were rapidly transformed into intolerance when they found themselves uppermost. Even, also, if those who executed Charles meant to further the arrival of "a government by compromise," this was neither the impression produced by their conduct nor its actual effect. Again, it is affirmed that his death "made it impossible for future rulers long to set public opinion at naught as he had done"; but (1) whatever the attitude of Charles to public opinion, public opinion was very much divided about him; (2) the Commons, the Army, and then again the Commons, set public opinion much more at naught than he did; and (3) his successor, Cromwell, was engaged until his death in setting it at naught.

Clarendon, while premising that the kingly virtues of Charles had "some mixture and alloy that prevented

them shining in their full lustre and producing those fruits they should have been attended with," yet concludes: "If he were not the greatest king, if he were without some parts and qualities which have made some kings great and happy, no other prince was ever unhappy who was possessed of half his virtues and endowments and so much without any kind of vice." He even affirms that he was "the worthiest gentleman, the best friend, the best husband, the best father and the best Christian, that the age in which he lived produced"; and if there be extravagance in the statement it was evidently dictated more by personal affection and sincere regret than by mere flunkeyism. The known facts also, in a manner, corroborate rather than discredit it. No king could be further removed from the merely selfish and brutal despot, intent only on his own self-aggrandisement and the gratification of his appetites and passions. Rather he belonged to the type of the narrow and impracticable idealist, so obsessed with his own sublime theories and notions that their immediate realisation at all hazards becomes a dominating passion. His failure as a sovereign has been charged to absorbing self-devotion, to the "want of sympathy with his people"; but there was in him no lack of sympathy with what he deemed their best interests; there was merely a lack of sympathy with what he deemed their pernicious opinions, and, more particularly, with the Puritan ecclesiasticism—an ecclesiasticism which he believed to be "absolutely unlawful." He had persuaded himself—just as others had done who had assumed ecclesiastical authority over their fellows—that he was the only proper judge of what his subjects ought to believe and of how they ought to worship. His reserved and distant manner did not imply lack of sympathy; he had, Clarendon states, "a tenderness and compassion of nature which

restrained him from doing a hard-hearted thing"; and while to the majority of the Scots he appeared in the guise of an overbearing tyrant, "he was always," Clarendon tells us, "a great lover of the Scottish nation." Indeed had Charles been a more purely selfish man than he was, had he been less conscientiously devoted to what he believed to be the truth, he might have retained his sovereignty; and he might have been much more successful in giving effect to his policy, had he, as Clarendon puts it, been "of a rougher and more imperious nature." It was his fatal misfortune to be at once passionately devoted to his ideals, and, when faced with opposition, to be "more irresolute than the conjuncture of his affairs would permit." Then being largely an idealist he was lacking in practical sagacity: he was often conciliatory when he should have been firm, and rash when caution and prudence were incumbent. In England he was too inconsiderate in pressing for the uniform observance of the minutiae of ceremonialism; in Scotland his ecclesiastical policy was marked both by gross imprudence and weak and insincere temporising; he displayed no skill anywhere in dealing with difficult emergencies; and he went out of his way to offend public sentiment.

In short, Charles, in exceptionally difficult circumstances, failed in the particular manner that he did fail, from his own peculiar faults plus the overmastering genius of Cromwell, to the development of which they largely contributed. But for special blunders he might have baffled his Parliamentary opponents so far as to have retained his sovereignty; but for blunders the conditions would not have been created which made the great career of Cromwell possible; and, again, notwithstanding his blunders, he might after a fashion have triumphed had he not in the end been confronted with Cromwell's transcendent personality—a quite unforeseen

possibility. What might have happened to the fortunes of Charles and Britain but for the advent of Cromwell, what might have happened to them had even the conclusion of the Treaty of Newport not been frustrated, it is very hard to tell; but the special weaknesses of Charles gave Cromwell his unique opportunity. In their absence Cromwell might have remained an obscure country squire; and while Charles was, so to speak, the creator of Cromwell, the peculiar idiosyncracies of both, and of Charles no less, it may be even more, than of Cromwell, were, for good or evil, the main determining factors of the events of their time, and for several generations largely coloured Britain's future. But for the special idiosyncracies of Charles—his practical ineffectiveness no less than his peculiar convictions—a quite different turn might have been given to the course of events and the political and ecclesiastical conflict. It is vain to blame him for the character of his convictions: so far as sovereignty was concerned he could hardly have entertained any other convictions than he did, and what is more, they were substantially identical with those expressed by his implacable opponent, Cromwell, when he declared that the main question for the people was, "What is for their good, not what pleases them." Cromwell thought he knew better than Charles what was for their good; but it is by no means certain that he did. Indeed, the peculiarity of the time was that it was specially difficult by any kind of arrangement to promote the nation's good, at least ecclesiastically, because of the prevalent belief that this had to be done by compulsion. Cromwell, no less than Charles, had, as a compulsory ecclesiastical ruler, to side with one party, and in doing so gave offence to many more than Charles had done. Both were more or less the victims of very exceptional circumstances, and thus, as Charles said of himself, "the

martyrs of the people." Cromwell, though he escaped execution, escaped it only by the aid of an armed force. His general unpopularity was much greater than that of Charles, and he failed as completely in his aims. If the career of Charles closed in dethronement and martyrdom, Cromwell's career, outwardly successful, inflicted on himself a long martyrdom and brought him to a premature grave, for he knew that he had not won the nation's trust, and had achieved no final settlement of the constitutional and ecclesiastical difficulty. As for their ideals, posterity has in a sense pronounced against both and yet for both. Time has gradually dissipated much that was extravagant and intolerant in the then prevalent forms of ecclesiasticism, and effected a solution of the constitutional problem that baffled Cromwell as much as Charles; but towards the character of both this ecclesiastical and constitutional solution, the convictions of Charles contributed their quota no less than did those of Cromwell.

The body of Charles was carried into a room at Whitehall, "where," says Clarendon, "he was exposed for many days to the public view, that all men might know that he was not alive." Then, after embalment, it was placed in a leaden coffin and conveyed to St James's. To prevent inconvenient displays of loyalty at its final resting-place, it was decided to bury it not in Henry VII.'s chapel, but "at Windsor, in a decent manner, provided that the whole expense should not exceed five hundred pounds." The Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hertford, and the Earls of Southampton and Lindsey, who had been of his bedchamber, desired "that they might have leave to perform the last duty to their dead master, and to wait upon him to his grave"; and this was granted, provided they awaited the arrival of the body at Windsor. So mutilated and defaced was the interior of St George's Chapel by

Puritan iconoclasm that it was only by the guidance of "a fellow of the town" that they were able to discover the vault of Henry VIII. and Jane Seymour. The grave was dug as near that place "as could conveniently be." The use of the Book of Common Prayer being illegal, the reading of the burial service by the Bishop of London was stopped by Colonel Whichcot, the governor of the castle, and the body was laid in the grave "without any words or other ceremonies than the tears and sighs of the few beholders." When Charles II. proposed to remove the body to Westminster, the new alterations in St George's Chapel had so "perplexed the memories" of the few survivors who had witnessed the burial, that they were unable to satisfy themselves where the body was interred. But the position of the grave was discovered later; and on the coffin being broken up, in 1813, the remains of Charles were identified.

In 1649 was published at the Hague *Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ*, &c., containing various letters and speeches of Charles. The *Εικῶν βασιλική*, included in it, has been proved the work of Dr John Gauden, a Presbyterian divine. Certain verses of Charles were published in Percy's *Reliques*, and some lines "Upon a Quiet Conscience" are attributed to him in Nahum Tate's *Miscellanea Sacra*. Sharing in his father's literary tastes, he was a friendly patron of men of letters, all the chief poets of the time being ardent loyalists, with the exception of Milton, who, however, wrote his *Masque of Comus* for the court festivities. These, says Horace Walpole, were carried on "with much taste and magnificence. Poetry, painting, music and architecture were all called in to make them rational amusements; and I have no doubt the celebrated festivals of Louis XIV. were copied from the shows exhibited at Whitehall, in its time the most polite court in Europe." The devotion of Charles to

elaborate ceremonials is partly accounted for by his bent towards art. He was an excellent performer on the viola di gambia; and he personally supervised the church services in the royal chapels. But his skilled artistic taste was more specially exemplified in the magnificent assortment of paintings and sculpture with which he adorned his palaces, and which, after his execution, were disposed of by the Puritans. Vandyke, whom he knighted, was his "principal painter in ordinary"; and amongst other artists whom he patronised were Rubens, whom he also knighted, Daniel Mytens, Gerard Honthorst, William Dobson, Peter Oliver, and Jean Petitot.

By Henrietta Maria, Charles I. had four sons and four daughters. The sons were: Charles, who died in infancy; Charles, who became king as Charles II.; James, who succeeded his brother; and Henry, Duke of Gloucester, who, at the Restoration, accompanied Charles II. to England, and died shortly afterwards of smallpox. The daughters were: Mary, who married William, Prince of Orange, and was the mother of William III.; Elizabeth, who remained in England after her father's execution and died at Carisbrooke, 8th September 1650; Anne, who died in infancy; and Henrietta Maria, who married Philip, Duke of Orleans, and whose descendants—the Sardinian line—now represent the elder branch of the royal Stewarts.

CHAPTER XI.

CHARLES II.—UNTIL THE RESTORATION.

CHARLES II. was born at St James's, 29th May 1630. Those riding in the king's procession to St Paul's next day, to give thanks for the queen's delivery, were witness to the appearance of a brilliant star [the planet Venus, then at the period of its greatest brightness] in the midday summer heavens. The strange phenomenon was bound to impress those who still devoutly believed in astrological influences. It was interpreted as a special omen of the child's brilliant and beneficent destiny; and poets and poetasters wracked their brains in coining conceits applicable to the conjuncture of star and birth. Though also the chances very soon seemed all against a favourable fortune for the child, it was to usher in the glories of the wondrous Restoration. Then at last seemed to be fulfilled the prognostication of, as Dryden wrote,

"That star that, at your birth, shone out so bright,
It stained the duller sun's meridian light."

The birth was esteemed an event of cardinal importance not only in England, but in Europe. The Puritans were hoping that, for lack of direct heirs to Charles I., the throne would be inherited by the Protestant house of the Palatinate, while the Catholic expectation was that the child's religion would be determined by his

mother. For the time being these latter hopes were disappointed. Charles announced to the Capuchins that they "need not trouble about the baptism of his son, as he would attend to it himself"; and on 27th June the child was baptised in the king's chapel of St James's by Laud, Bishop of London. Objections being taken to the appointment of Lady Roxburgh as governess, on account of her supposed Catholic leanings, the appointment was cancelled, and later bestowed on Lady Dorset. The nurse was Mrs Wyndham—wife of Colonel Wyndham, later governor of Bridgewater—for whom, "a woman of no good breeding," he continued, says Clarendon, to have "an extraordinary kindness."

The young Prince of Wales was far from ordinary looking. "He is so fat and so big," writes his proud, but only half-contented, mother to Madame de St George, "that he is taken for a year old, and he is only four months. . . . I will send you his portrait as soon as he is a little fairer, for at present he is so dark that I am ashamed of him." Later she describes him as having "no ordinary mien," but admits him to be ugly as well as dark. He was to retain with his physical vigour his swarthinness and his very marked mien, which, if lacking in comeliness, was not destitute of a certain rude, if latterly somewhat battered, majesty.

On completing his ninth year he was committed to the care of William Cavendish, Earl, and afterwards Duke, of Newcastle: "A very fine gentleman," says Clarendon, "active and full of courage, and most accomplished in those qualities of horsemanship, dancing, and fencing which accompany good breeding"; and, according to Newcastle, he became one of the most admirable and accomplished horsemen of his time. His tutor was Dr Brian Duppa, Chancellor of Salisbury, "every way qualified," says Clarendon, "for his functions, espe-

cially as to the comeliness of his person and gracefulness of his deportment."

For his charge Newcastle wrote a paper of instructions, to which Charles would appear to have paid some heed. If he became a "bad king," it was not from being too "good a man," or falling into "a divine melancholy to be an anchorite or Capuchin." None knew better how "to play the king"; but having the saving grace of humour, he was not "so seared with majesty" as to think he "was not of mankind"; and as for the maxim that he could not be "too civil to women," this seems to have been the most superfluous of the instructions.

The child had a more precocious initiation into the sterner side of life than usually falls to the lot of princes. When his father, in 1640, was in the throes of his dilemma about the Scots' invasion, he was reported to have been weeping bitterly for five days; and on the king asking the cause of his trouble, he replied: "My grandfather left you four kingdoms, and I am afraid your Majesty will leave me never a one." At the meeting of the Long Parliament, he took his seat in the House of Lords, and on 1st May was entrusted with his father's petition for the commutation of Strafford's sentence. Shortly after the execution Newcastle resigned his charge of the prince, which was bestowed on the Marquis of Hertford, who, Clarendon says, "lacked some of those qualities which might have been wished in a person to be trusted with the education of a great and hopeful prince." But Hertford was to have little to do with the prince's making or marring. Within a few months of his appointment occurred the fatal break with the Parliament, and the prince set out with his father for the north. Accompanying the army in its southward march, he and his brother, the Duke of York, received their "baptism of fire" at Edgehill.

Here, when in imminent danger of capture by a detachment of horse, the prince, affirming that he feared them not, drew his pistol, and but for the restraint of his attendants would have charged. During the retirement to Oxford after the reconnaissance round London, he fell sick of the measles at Reading.

At Oxford, the prince was committed to the care of the Earl of Berkshire, whom Clarendon describes as quite "unfit for that province, or any other that required any proportion of wisdom and understanding for the discharge of it." The king and queen acceded to the appointment simply to do Berkshire a favour, and because they expected that the prince would be chiefly under their own immediate supervision.

The prince sat in the Royalist Parliament at Oxford, and he accompanied his father in the prosperous western campaigns. But after the disastrous occurrences in the north, the king began to think that "himself and the prince were too much to venture into one bottom," and resolved to send him to the west, partly to aid in rallying the Royalist cause, partly, if matters came to the worst, to secure the possibility of his escape to France. The Earl of Berkshire accompanied him, but "without any more authority than every one of the council had"; and so the prince, says Clarendon, was left "without a governor, which would have been a little better if he had been without the Earl of Berkshire too." Falling at Bridgewater under the influence of his old nurse, Mrs Wyndham, and other foolish persons, the prince adopted an attitude towards the council which caused it, says Clarendon, "to be much neglected and undervalued." This greatly hampered its efforts to reconcile the military malcontents and remedy the general confusion and disorder; and after the defeat of the king at Naseby, 14th June 1645, left Fairfax free to deal with the

western regions, the situation quickly became hopeless.

After taking refuge in Pendennis Castle, the prince, on 2nd March 1645-6, embarked secretly for Scilly; but being threatened there by the Parliamentary fleet he was transferred to Jersey, where he landed on 17th April, the inhabitants expressing their loyal joy by bonfires on all the hills. Here his tactful courtesy and abounding good nature enabled him to fill his position of semi-royalty with unqualified success. The council, who were averse to his transference to France, did their utmost to provide him with amusement; and to gratify his passion for the sea, a beautiful yacht was built for him at St Malo.

The king and queen being now more anxious than ever for foreign aid, were hopeful that the prince's presence in France would hasten its procurement, and he set sail thither on 14th June; but Mazarin and the queen-mother of France, after having done their utmost to secure his arrival, now desired to convey to the English Parliament that he had come "thither without their aid and against their will." They did nothing to aid his father in his desperate circumstances. They granted the prince an allowance, but only indirectly, and as an addition to his mother's pension; and as she was stinting herself on behalf of her husband's cause, she expected a like self-sacrifice from her son. If Clarendon is to be believed, she decided on his clothes and other necessities, and dispensed allowances to him with so sparing a hand that he was never "master of ten pistoles to dispose of as he desired." She also kept him in profound ignorance of her political intrigues and purposes; and her main concern about him, meanwhile, was to effect his marriage to her niece, Mademoiselle de Montpensier [*La Grande Mademoiselle*], daughter of the Duke of

Orleans, and in her own right the richest heiress in Europe.

Mademoiselle, who was three years the prince's senior, describes him, with a tone of friendly patronage, as "very tall of his age, with a beautiful head, black hair, a brown complexion, and a very tolerable personality"; the only drawback being that he neither spake nor knew a word of French. His mother, Mademoiselle informs us, did her utmost to persuade her that he was deeply in love and talked of it incessantly; and to gratify his mother, the prince went through certain dumb manifestations of devotion; but he had no intention of becoming his mother's tool. Mademoiselle, again, was mainly amused by his mother's stories, though she archly remarks she did not know what might have happened had he himself spoken. Her chief ambition was to become the consort of the widowed emperor, Ferdinand III., though he was older than her father; for as she candidly avows, she valued the establishment more than the husband. Suddenly disappointed by the emperor's marriage to Maria Leopoldina, she then began to scheme for her marriage to his brother, the Archduke Leopold.

Our information about the prince at this time is derived mainly from the *Mémoires* of Mademoiselle de Montpensier and Madame de Motteville; and they tell us but little about the real character of his life. One hour a day he read with Dr Earle, who had succeeded Duppa as his tutor, and another was devoted to the study of mathematics under the philosopher Hobbes; but not being studiously inclined, it might have been better for him to have joined, as he vainly wished, the French troops in Flanders. Still his limited pocket-money tended to restrict his indulgence in the varied frivolities of the town. Burnet's statement that Buckingham "set himself to corrupt

him," &c., seems incorrect as regards this period of his life, and the further one that, under the pretence of teaching him mathematics, Hobbes was brought to "complete the matter," is mere prejudice.

After the Isle of Wight "Engagement," a pressing invitation was sent the prince to join the Scottish army under Hamilton. On 25th June 1648, he therefore set out for Calais, whence he proceeded to Holland, to be at least, as Sir Edward Nicholas expressed it, on "the wing ready for their assistance." Meanwhile on learning that the revolted loyalist portion of the fleet was at Helvoetsluys with his brother the Duke of York, just escaped from England, he joined it there. Both princes were in high spirits at the prospect of going into action with the fleet; but his brother decided not to take the duke with him, when, with Lord Willoughby as vice-admiral, he set sail "to oppose," as he proudly wrote to Hamilton, "the common enemy both to you and to us"; though nothing was achieved by it beyond the capture of some merchant ships, which were released on the payment of £12,000 by the London Common Council.

Lauderdale now reached the fleet with a pressing request to the prince to join the Scottish army; but on the rumour arising of his intention to leave the fleet, the sailors crowded the deck, threatening to throw Colepeper and Lauderdale into the sea, and urging immediate action against the Parliamentary fleet under Warwick. When, however, the ships cleared for action, the fleets were suddenly separated by a storm, and scarcity of provisions now caused a return to Holland. Warwick, following in the wake, lay opposite Helvoetsluys; but the States would permit no fighting in their waters. Meantime the prince was laid up by an attack of smallpox, and after Warwick's departure the command of the fleet was given to

Rupert, who sailed with it to Ireland. The victorious career of Cromwell in Scotland freed the prince from any promise he had made to Lauderdale, and caused him to return bootless, which, says Clarendon, who bitterly hated him, he did with "as much rage and malice against the prince as against Cromwell himself." The prince was now spending his time at the court of the young Prince and Princess of Orange, where were also the dowager Princess Amelia, and his aunt, the Princess Palatine and their children. Outside the palace he had also a clandestine establishment of his own, having, before he joined the fleet, succumbed to the attractions of Lucy Walter or Barlow—"a beautiful, brown, bold, but insipid creature," says Evelyn—who, though of good Welsh family, had been living under the protection of Colonel Robert Sidney. On 9th April 1649 she bore a son, whom Charles acknowledged, and later created Duke of Monmouth.

Early in January the prince received tidings of his father's threatened doom; and after receiving no reply to his appeal to Fairfax and the Council of War, sent to the Commons a blank paper, signed and sealed by himself, in which they might write any condition they chose as the price of his father's life. The proposal did more credit to his feelings than to his judgment or his conscience; but the Commons took no advantage of it. They were past making pactions with any of the royal house of Stewart; their purpose was that henceforth "England should be governed as a commonwealth"; and after the king's execution they proceeded to abolish both the House of Lords and the office of king, and constituted themselves perpetual rulers of England.

On 4th February Dr Stephen Goffe addressed the prince as "Your Majesty"; and, says Clarendon, "though he had known the desperate state his father

was long in, yet the barbarous stroke so surprised him that he was in all the confusion imaginable, and all about him were almost bereft of their understanding." But it was immediately determined that advantage should be taken of the revulsion of sentiment to promote the son's restoration. Montrose, whom the shock of the terrible tidings caused to swoon away, swore, on recovering consciousness, to dedicate his life to this purpose and the revenging of the murder. "I'll sing," so he concluded the verses in which he sought relief for his overpowering grief and anger—

"I'll sing thine obsequies with trumpet-sounds,
And write thine epitaph with blood and wounds."

On 22nd February Charles created Montrose governor-general of Scotland and captain-general of all the forces reared there, and of all others which might be brought thither out of England and Ireland. Had it been possible to have made the appointment a reality, his own Scottish experiences could hardly have been so mortifying as they turned out to be; but though cherishing an equally deep resentment against the English sectaries for the murder of their sovereign, the Scottish partisans were still prepared to anathematise each other with undiminished fervour; and the bulk of the nation would as soon have entrusted the command of their forces to Satan as to the banned and excommunicated James Graham.

Although, on 5th February, Charles was proclaimed at Edinburgh, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, his admission to royal authority was conditional on his giving satisfaction concerning religion according to the Covenants. The different Scottish parties were soon represented at the Hague. The clerical party, still bent on the Covenanting conquest

of England, were anxious to secure possession of him for this purpose; the Engagers, who, by the Act of Classes, had been disqualified from sitting in Parliament, or holding any public office, were hopeful, through the king, to obtain restitution of their privileges; Montrose and his friends, banned as "Malignants," were longing for revenge on Argyll and others, as well as the king's reinstatement; and Argyll, publicly represented by the Covenanting commissioners, and privately by Will Murray, was, while specially hostile to Montrose, yet, according to his *Instructions to a Son*, full of doubt and distraction.

In the end Charles was disposed to allow the Covenanters to have their will in Scotland, provided they allowed him a free hand in England; but since this did not satisfy them, he resolved to have recourse to Montrose with whom Clarendon—who detested that "damned Covenant"—and other members of the council were in complete sympathy. They and Charles would have preferred a reconciliation between the Engagers and Montrose; "but," says Clarendon, "he could as easily have persuaded the Parliament to reject Cromwell, as the Lords of the Engagement and those who had joined with the Duke of Hamilton to be reconciled to Montrose." Montrose was therefore empowered to treat with princes and states for men for a Scottish expedition. Clarendon and Cottington went on a begging mission to Madrid; and Charles with a like purpose to Brussels; but, owing to the bad relations between Spain and France, both missions proved vain.

From Brussels Charles went to St Germain's to visit his mother on his way to join Ormonde in Ireland. For some piquant details of the visit we are indebted to Mademoiselle de Montpensier. His mother, Mazarin and the Queen of France, had practically arranged that he should marry her. She professes

that his slight interest in his own state affairs, his engrossment in bagatelles, and his preference of substantial beef and mutton to the daintier delicacies of the table, did not prepossess her in his favour; but evidently his indifferent attitude to the proposal, though he formally acquiesced in it, surprised and disconcerted her. While her money was some temptation to him, his needs being great, pecuniary embarrassments gave him no deep concern. Probably also he had a temporary preference for his cousin Sophia, the youngest of the Palatinate princesses, whom he had complimented with the strong asseveration that she was handsomer than Lucy Walter; but seemingly he was not in haste to rush into matrimony or betrothal. While in his mother's presence he backed her affirmation that he would become a most devoted husband, by stating that any amour in which he might indulge—Lucy Walter had openly accompanied him to Paris—would certainly be extinguished by marriage, Mademoiselle recognised that he was talking as he did merely for courtesy's sake; and, moreover, in the midst of the make-believe courtship, a new turn was given to her fancy by the death of the Empress. "I was thinking," she says, "of the Emperor, and could of nothing else."

But if Charles was politely complaisant towards his mother's matrimonial arrangements for him, it was otherwise as regards his political confidence. On his business, says Clarendon, "she found him so reserved as if he had no mind she should be conversant in it, and did as good as desire her not to trouble herself in his affairs." On Clarendon's arrival Charles informed him of what had passed between them—"all in a more exalted dialect than he had been accustomed"; and the queen complained, "not without tears, of the king's unkindness towards her"; but in the end she was

partly soothed by a message that "the good of his affairs" required meanwhile "more reservation towards the queen, and to have it believed that he communicated less with her than he intended to do."

On 17th September Charles set sail with the Duke of York to Jersey to await the development of events in Ireland before venturing thither. The time passed pleasantly in shooting, hunting, and yachting, and in various court functions, a prominent figure in which was Mrs Wyndham, who "governed the king and every one else like a Minister of State." His one drawback was lack of cash, which compelled him to put his attendants "on board wages, to be paid when money is sent." Meanwhile Ormonde's prospects in Ireland were being shattered by Cromwell; and on 27th September he informed Charles that the only hope of preserving "any position in this kingdom" was by his presence. This letter he did not receive, and a messenger he sent for information wrote, on 3rd November, that, without money to raise troops, he could not advise him to come to Ireland.

On 29th September Charles had directed Montrose to go on in the "prosecution of the trust committed" to him; and now when the loss of Ireland seemed imminent, he still hoped that Montrose would either by a display of force persuade the Presbyterian Scots to reasonable terms, or by armed interference compel their submission. Even later than this he appears to have been inclined "to stand or fall, to be happy or ruined with the party of Montrose"; but he wished if possible to secure a peaceful solution of the difficulty. In answer, July 1st, to the commissioners of the Committee of Estates for the resumption of negotiations, he hoped that they would be guided by "a just and prudent moderation." At the same time he sent further letters to Montrose to proceed with his pre-

parations, his hope being that this would tend to produce "an agreement and a present union of that whole nation in our service." While treating with the Scots, he was not seeking to lead Montrose astray as to his real intentions. Nor does Montrose's last letter to him of 20th March imply, as has been stated, that Montrose felt he was being betrayed by him. Knowing that the Covenanting leaders, including Argyll, were again seeking to come to terms with him, he simply warns him against "their too open craft," and urges him to be guided "by the zealous opinion of your faithful servants, who have nothing in their heart, nor before their eyes, but the joy of your Majesty's prosperity and greatness." Left to himself, Montrose could not have effected the restoration of Charles. This Charles now saw clearly enough; but he did not sufficiently recognise how impossible it was for Montrose to make even a diversion in his favour while he was in negotiations with the Covenanters.

The agreement of Charles with the Covenanters was as morally indefensible as it was utterly foolish; but he was led into it step by step. Although his courtesy and self-command never failed him in his intercourse with the arrogant and opinionated deputies, he made no secret of his deep aversion to their terms. When they declined to permit Covenanting Scotland to be desecrated by the presence of his Episcopalian chaplains, he privately "broke out into a great passion and bitter execration against them"; even while demeaning himself—as Cromwell had done—by expressing his own willingness to take the Covenant (should this be required of him when he came to Scotland), he sought to avoid promising more than his assent to any Acts of Parliament that might be passed for the establishment of Presbyterianism in England; he declined to

amend the treaty made with the Irish, which exempted them from the action of the penal laws against the Catholics; and only at the last did he give it privately to be understood that he would agree to this should the Scottish Parliament request him to do so. On 8th May a draft agreement with the commissioners was signed by him for submission to the Scottish Parliament.

The disgraceful character of the transaction was later privately confessed by two of the severest Covenanting commissioners. "We did," wrote Alexander Jaffray, "both sinfully entangle and engage the nation, ourselves, and that poor young Prince . . . making him sign and swear what we knew, from clear and demonstrable reasons, that he hated in his heart"; and the clergyman Livingstone affirms that the guilt was that "of the whole State—yea, of the Church." It is also to be said on his behalf that he was encouraged to forswear himself by influential friends who were older and more experienced than he. On their advice he embarked for Scotland without signing the Covenant, in the hope that when he should be there he "should be no more importuned in it"; and the Queen of Sweden and the Prince of Orange advised him to sign it in terms that would secure him "a foot and possession, and afterwards keep only what he pleased." He was also encouraged by Argyll—whose great terror was Montrose—to believe that in the end he would not be required to do more than grant the Covenant to Scotland; and, besides, he knew that whatever he might swear, it was beyond his power to impose it on England. But his conduct greatly shocked many of his most loyal supporters. "If there be judgment under Heaven," wrote Hyde (Clarendon), "I earnestly pray it may fall as light on him as may be." "It hath had a strange effect upon all his party in England," wrote Hatton; and Henrietta Maria deemed it ad-

visible to protest that she had "not been a party to induce him to sacrifice his honour and his conscience." But the one most vitally affected by the proposed agreement was Montrose. True, it is hardly possible to doubt that Charles stipulated for an indemnity to him. The notes of Secretary Long can hardly imply less than this. We cannot suppose that he would stipulate for an indemnity to the nobles supporting Montrose and not to Montrose himself, who was "to stay in safety for a competent time in Scotland, and ship to lye provided for transporting where he pleased." But even to the last he hankered after utilising him to constrain the Covenanters to mitigate their terms. He made little account of the great risks of Montrose; and he privately instructed Sir William Fleming to use his discretion in advising him whether to disband or not.

But the fate of Montrose was not affected by these late omissions or commissions. He received none of the new royal instructions before his small force was overwhelmed by Strahan at Invercarron on 27th April 1650. On 4th May he was captured in Assynt, and on the 21st he was executed at the Grassmarket, Edinburgh. The prospect of an agreement between the Covenanters and Charles in no degree tempered their bitter hatred towards the excommunicated James Graham. The letters of Charles to him and to the Parliament about his laying down his arms were withheld from it until the 25th, four days after all was over. According to the summary of the latter letter in Balfour's *Annals* he stated that "he was not accessory to the said invasion in the least degree"; but the Parliament, as well as he, would know this to be false; and this summary differs essentially from the abstract in Gardiner's *Charles II. and Scotland in 1650*. The latter is to the effect that he was "grieved to hear that there had

been some blood shed of late," and that as the reports of the "manner and result thereof" did "very much trouble him," he would "be glad to hear the particulars more certainly." When he learned of the execution he was so disturbed and indignant that it was with difficulty he was persuaded to embark for Scotland.

Delivered from the peril of Montrose, the Covenanters adopted a still more arrogant attitude; and the Parliament directed the commissioners to insist on stricter terms than those to which, on 1st May, Charles had signified his agreement; but the knowledge of them was designedly withheld from him until he was on board ship, lest they should provoke him "to take some other course and not come to Scotland at all." After long debate, and strong protests on his part, he at last stated his willingness to assent to them; and he signed them shortly before disembarkation at Garmouth-on-Spey on 24th June.

Charles was thus virtually caught in a trap. The commissioners had been able to use compulsion towards him; and though he had previously gone further in his compliance than one of strict honour should have done, he might now plead that he was fully justified in using deceit to preserve his life and liberty. Nor were the conditions on which he signed fulfilled. He obtained no royal authority whatever. He was the mere captive of the Covenanting clergy who set themselves to secure his conversion in the same thorough-going fashion they were accustomed to employ towards their humblest parishioners. None of the nobles or gentry were permitted access to him except such as "were of Argyll and his party." Those of the Engagers who accompanied him from Holland were relegated to strict confinement in different parts of the country, and only nine, specially selected, of his English followers were permitted to remain with him, and those virtually on

probation. While permitted to dine in royal state, supplied with good horses to ride and fitting attendants to accompany him, and "in all public appearances" he "seemed to want nothing that was due to a great king," he was not only not consulted in State affairs, but was in reality a prisoner. "The clergy also," says Clarendon, "were in such a continual attendance about him that he was never free from their importunity," . . . "they obliged him to the constant hearing of their long prayers, and made him observe the Sundays with more rigour than the Jews accustomed to do their Sabbath, and reprehended him sharply if he smiled on these days, and if his looks and gestures did not please them, whilst all their prayers and sermons, at which he was compelled to be present, were libels and bitter invectives against all the actions of his father, the idolatries of his mother, and his own malignity."

Never was there, perhaps, in any country a king in so peculiar a quandary or a political arrangement so ludicrously impracticable. If it was vain in Charles to seek to cozen the Covenanters, it was equally vain in them to seek to inspire him with their own peculiar "celestial fire." The Ethiopian might be expected to change his skin and the leopard its spots before he could be transformed into a sincere Covenanting king. In some respects, however, he was an apt enough ecclesiastical pupil. His quick dramatic sense enabled him to master with great facility their peculiar sentiments and the exact tone of their phraseology, though the hopes aroused by his conversational devoutness were sadly shaken by his indiscreet indulgence in dancing and card-playing, not to mention certain amatory adventures which, 'twas said, aroused "the general dissatisfaction of his best friends."

From his singular thralldom he looked for some relief

through the threatened invasion by Cromwell; but the enthusiasm of the soldiers when he visited the camp at Leith caused the clerical commissioners, on the plea of regard to his personal safety, to insist on his withdrawal from the army and his seclusion in Dunfermline. Further, the clergy now began to entertain the apprehension that God would not grant them victory while their army was defiled by the presence in it of "Engagers and Malignants," and besides purging it of them and thus greatly weakening its military efficiency, they now required Charles to sign a Declaration setting forth his shame and sorrow, not only for his own sins but for those of his whole house, and particularly his father's opposition to the Covenant and his mother's idolatry, &c. The aim of all this was to make sure of the supremacy of the Covenant in both kingdoms, but by resolving that the "Engagers" should have neither lot nor part in the hoped-for triumph over Cromwell, they merely saved Cromwell from almost inevitable disaster.

Charles desired them to be "as sparing of his father's name as necessary could be"; but he was informed that unless he signed, communication would be opened up with Cromwell; and after, to "resolve his doubts," certain alterations had been made in the phraseology, he being told by Argyll and others that it was needful, meanwhile, to "please these mad men," complied with their request. In a letter to Lord Beauchamp, while asserting the Declaration to be "forced and constrained," he adds, "pray be wary to whom you communicate this secret." He also asks him to remove the apprehensions of the Catholics, but he advises that he and the loyalists should link themselves as much as possible with the Presbyterians, because if the English army does "not move upon the Presbyterian interest, or at least with their consent and concurrence, the

Scots would fight against them." At the same time he assured the Dean of Tuam that however he might be forced by the necessity of his affairs to appear otherwise, he was a true child of the Church of England and a true Cavalier.

It was the extreme policy of the Covenanters that was rendering the restoration of Charles impossible. Had they been content to allow England to manage its own affairs, the action of Cromwell might have been paralysed by overwhelming difficulties there. Making allowance for the peculiar phraseology of the period, there was substantial truth in Cromwell's affirmation, that in seeking to obtrude Charles on England as a Covenanted king, they were making "a covenant with death and hell"; and he was hardly amiss in discerning in his own great victory at Dunbar on 3rd September "the great hand of God" against their meddling with "worldly policies" to set up "that which they call the Kingdom of Christ." They, however, were merely amazed that God should thus suffer "His elect and chosen" to be destroyed; and the Assembly officially declared their suspicion that this might be due to the king's "hypocrisy in complying with them, not for conscience, but for the love of a crown." Charles again was, so far as concerned language, as equal to the occasion as either Cromwell or the Scottish clergy. "We cannot but acknowledge"—so, in admirable parody of his mentors, he devoutly cants,—“that the stroke and trial is very hard to be borne, and would be impossible for us and you in human strength . . . but we have religion, the Gospel, and the Covenant, against which hell shall not prevail, much less a number of sectaries stirred up by it”; and, continues he, “We shall strive to be humble that the Lord may be appeased,” &c.

Nevertheless, just before the battle, he had written

to Nicholas that the "villainy" of the Covenanters was "beyond imagination." Nor did he deem their defeat altogether a calamity. On the contrary, their now weakened and discredited condition suggested a scheme for deliverance from their supremacy by placing himself under the protection of the Engagers. Unhappily, he communicated his intention to Buckingham, who, for reasons of his own, persuaded him to send warnings to his friends not to appear on the morrow, as was proposed, at the Bridge of Earn. Learning, however, of a second proposal to purge his household, Charles, at one o'clock of 4th October, set out from Perth with seven or eight adherents, on pretence of hawking, and "riding at a full career," reached Dudhope House, near Dundee, at three in the afternoon. Thence he pursued his journey the same evening to a cottage at Clova; but since Lord Montgomery, who had followed hard on his track with 600 horse, came up with him the next morning, he had no option but to return with him to Perth, where he stated the unhappy business had befallen him "by the wicked counsel of some men who had deceived him," and enigmatically declared that "it would be a lesson to him all the days of his life."

The "Start," as it was called, did prove a lesson, if not to Charles, to the less extreme Covenanters. An Act of Indemnity was passed on behalf of the Royalists involved in it; and in opposition to the remonstrances of the extremists (hence known as Remonstrants), who now declared the treaty with Charles to have been a sin from the beginning, the majority (known as Resolutioners) resolved to come to terms with the Engagers and loyalists, on their taking the Covenant and making public profession of their repentance. Then followed the strange spectacle of Engagers and loyalists making public repentance in their several parish kirks, arrayed in sackcloth, "the ministers of the Gospel knowing," so

asserts Sir James Turner, one of the professed penitents, "that their repentances" were "but counterfeit."

Following this picturesque display of sham contrition, two solemn fasts were appointed preparatory to the king's coronation, 1st January 1651, the one on 22nd December, at which the nation was called to humiliate itself, the other on the 26th, at which he was required to mourn publicly for his own, his father's, and his grandfather's sins. At the conclusion of the long sederunt of praying, sermonising, psalm-singing and mourning, the decorous and long-suffering but wearied and afflicted king was moved to remark, "I think I must repent also that ever I was born." At the coronation he had to submit to a similar obsession of devotions, not to mention the renewal of his Covenanting oaths, but bore himself throughout "very seriously and devoutly, so that none doubted of his ingenuity and sincerity"; and once crowned, he began to wield a new influence. His great social dexterity, aided by the menacing danger of Cromwell, enabled him to unite the bulk of the nation in loyal support of himself and to collect a much better fighting force than that routed at Dunbar. He was now able also to free himself from the domination of Argyll, who had been scheming to marry him to his daughter Anne, but whose sway was at an end after the repeal, on 22nd June, of the Act of Classes. Still, so heartily sick had he become of his position in Scotland, that he seized almost eagerly the opportunity given him by Cromwell—who by skilful manœuvring had placed himself between Perth and Stirling—for a march into England. But, unhappily, his paction with the Covenanters had bewildered the English loyalists; while the Presbyterians, who received at least toleration from Cromwell, could hardly feel assured that their position would be improved under Charles. Deserted by nearly half his Scottish troops,

he received no considerable English accessions; and when, on 27th August, he entered Worcester his forces numbered only about 13,000, while Cromwell, with a force of 30,000, was speedily between him and London. He had thus no option but to disband his followers or await his doom in Worcester. Incited by his energy and ardour, his small army on 3rd September engaged in a desperate struggle against hopelessly superior numbers. At the very last he was loathe to accept defeat; and his deep chagrin "at the consequences of this fatal day" tended to make him impatient of David Leslie's cool distinction between the possible and the impossible. He had, however, no option but to attach himself to Leslie's horse, as about six o'clock they rode out of the town. At nightfall he separated himself from the main body, and with sixty chosen followers rode to a recusant's house at White Ladies, which was reached by daybreak.

Followed six weeks of weary and dangerous skulking in the west of England, during which he owed much to good luck, much to the countenance and devotion of those in whom he put his trust, and not a little to his own ready wit and unfaltering presence of mind. His nerve and coolness—outstanding characteristics of his peculiar personality—had now a quite different sphere for their exercise than that supplied by Covenanting Scotland; and with all its imminent dangers and physical hardships he probably preferred the rôle of a skulking fugitive to that of a Covenanted king. In his own inimitable fashion, he was afterwards accustomed to recite with much gusto the humours of his hairbreadth escapes: of how he hounded the Puritan blacksmith by his fervent zeal against "that rogue, Charles Stewart," for bringing in the Scots; of his chance adventure with the Puritan soldiers in the inn yard at Burford, through the midst of whom he

designedly blundered his way with his horse into the stable, to their great indignation at his unceremoniousness; of his talk with the ostler, who said, "Sure, sir, I know your face," which he capped by affirming that he had served his old master, Mr Porter, in Exeter; of his difficulties with the toasting-jack in the kitchen of Long Marston, which caused him to explain to the cook that he was "a poor tenant of Colonel Lane in Staffordshire," and seldom had roast beef; and of his talk at the table of his host with a new-comer, who, on account of his cropped hair and very plain attire, addressed him as "Brother Roundhead," and whose indulgence in an oath he rebuked with, "O dear brother, that was a 'scape; swear not at all, I beseech thee."

In the end an agreement was made on 11th October with a skipper named Tattersall to convey him and Lord Wilmot, in the character of two duellists, from Shoreham to France for £60. On being introduced to Charles at supper the skipper recognised him as the prince with the fleet which had captured his ship in 1648; but happily the ship had been let go, and the skipper was thus quite friendly, though, on account of the great risk, he required the insurance of his boat for £200. Landing at Fécamp on the 17th, they proceeded to Rouen, where they barely escaped detention as vagrants. On arriving at Paris Charles was supplied by Lord Jermyn with his first change of shirt; and de Ritz borrowed 1500 pistoles, which he sent to Lord Taafe for his master's use. This was a wonderfully welcome gift, for on the very night of his arrival his mother told him that he would have to share with her the expense of his evening meal. In the end 6000 livres a-month were settled on him by the French Government, but the first instalment was more than absorbed by his debts.

In his forlorn condition he showed himself not indis-

posed to coincide with the still cherished project of his mother for his marriage to *la Grande Mademoiselle*, "both," says Clarendon, "looking too much upon the relief it might give to his present necessities"; for it would by no means improve the prospects of his Restoration. When, on the day after his arrival, she paid his mother a visit, that unwearied and solicitous lady warned her that she would find him "looking very ridiculous" on account of his cropped hair and the dress of a "very extraordinary kind" which he still wore. But Mademoiselle thought "he had a very fine figure and was looking much better than before." On the other hand, an English lady of the court thought that his features had worsened, and that he had a reckless air. His strange and rigorous experiences had, we must suppose, left their mark on him; for good or evil he was more of a man; but what procured him Mademoiselle's approbation was his changed manner towards herself, that he was, as she said, "doux, civil, galant." Still, she could not make up her mind to marry one whose fortunes were so problematical and had lately received so severe a set back. Though urgently besieged by his mother, wooed with much seeming earnestness and with fascinating courtesy by Charles, and "horribly" pressed by the Duchess d'Arguillon, who urged that it was her duty as a Catholic to secure the young man's conversion, she gradually became coy, and in the end required him not to visit her so often.

Charles, in his light-hearted fashion, took his rebuff with cheerful resignation, all the more that he was finding consolation in the society of the bewitching Isabelle - Angelique de Montmorency, widow of Gaspard de Coligny, Duc de Chatillon. Clarendon describes her as "of a great beauty, of a presence very graceful and alluring, and a behaviour that captivated

all admitted into her presence"; and he tells us the king had often seen her "with that esteem and inclination which few were without." Among her admirers were the Earl of Bristol and Lord Crofts, who, while recognising that their passion for her was hopeless, were so much under her spell as to be desirous of gratifying her by promoting her marriage with the King of England. She asked him "to preserve that affection and inclination for an object more equal to him"—at the same time employing her arts "to influence him to new importunities"; but Clarendon advised him to comply with her spoken request, and Charles, recognising the wisdom of the advice, proceeded no further in the matter. Later, on his quitting Paris in 1654, Bristol and Crofts suggested that civility required him to pay his respects to her at Melun, on the way to Flanders; but though he did so, he escaped further entanglement.

Meantime the unpleasant relations of Charles with his jealous and overbearing mother, his dark political prospects, impoverished fortunes, and lack of any definite purpose to occupy his interest, were tending to develop a careless recklessness which was the curious blend of his better and his worse qualities. His restless energy could find in Paris no scope except in the pursuit of pleasure, to which, wrote Clarendon, he is so much given, "that if he stay here he will be undone. Add to this, that the usage of the French towards him is not to be endured." The difficulty was how to get away "without money"; but when the friendly relations between France and Cromwell rendered further stay in Paris impossible, Mazarin, besides paying the arrears of his allowance, procured him a considerable sum by the sale of the brass cannon of Rupert's fleet; and he received £2500 from the

English loyalists, who promised him more, provided he remained out of France.

On 8th July 1654 he left Paris to visit his widowed sister, the Princess of Orange,—the Prince had died 6th November 1650—at Spa, and having accompanied her to Cologne, on her way to Holland, he was so captivated by the beauty of the city that he took up his residence there for the winter. “He now,” according to Clarendon, “betook himself with much cheerfulness to compose his mind to his fortunes,” spending many hours a-day in reading and studying Italian and French; and “at other times walked much upon the walls of the town, and sometimes rid into the fields, and, on the whole, spent his time very well.” The long evenings were whiled away with music and dancing: “we dance and play,” so he wrote, “as if we had taken the Plate fleet.”

While at Spa, a flattering account reached him of the success of Middleton in the Scottish Highlands, with an urgent request to venture thither; but the prospect of a second Scottish adventure had no charms for him: “it was impossible for him,” he said, “to live there in security or health.” Shortly afterwards occurred Middleton’s defeat at Dalnaspidal. A Royalist committee termed “the sealed knot” had been preparing to co-operate with him for a rising in England, and Charles had gone secretly to Middelburg to be ready to cross to England should a favourable report reach him; but the Highland disaster led to the suspension of further action, and certain unauthorised movements were easily suppressed. Charles was certainly not responsible for a proclamation, offering in his name full pardon, a coloneley, and £500 to any one who would kill Cromwell, although he had as little hesitation in countenancing plots against Cromwell as Cromwell had

in offering a high reward for his capture as "a traitor"; and the pamphlet, *Killing no Murder*, had doubtless his assent.

The alliance between Cromwell and France, concluded 24th October 1655, suggested to Charles a bargain with Spain; and in the end of March 1656, a treaty of a more or less make-believe character was signed at Brussels by him, the Archduke, and Don Alfonso, the clause of most immediate interest to him being probably that providing him with a month's allowance of 6000 guilders, and half of that sum to the Duke of York. While Spain engaged to assist him, "when the time was deemed ripe," in the recovery of his throne, he agreed to enrol the English, Scots and Irish soldiers, then in the service of France, into regiments for the help of Spain; and on the recovery of his throne, to do his utmost to secure the repeal of the penal laws against the Catholics. By the terms of the treaty he removed from Cologne to Bruges; but not until three months did its authorisation arrive from Spain, and the first instalment was not to be paid until the middle of the month. So clamant became his necessities that Clarendon wrote: "If he has not a very speedy supply he must take horse and tell Don John he is plainly run away from starvation and from seeing his servants begging in the streets, or be handed to prison." But though always more or less pinched for money, Charles and his court were not lacking in gaieties. According to a Cromwellian agent, "greater abominations were never practised among people than at this day in Charles' court," special mention being made of a company of French comedians, "very punctually attended by Charles Stewart and his court and all the ladies there," the "most solemn day of acting,"—as usual then and now in Catholic countries—being "on the Lord day." But apart from amusements

offensive only to Puritanism, dissoluteness and carousal were the court's too favourite panaceas for ennui; and Charles had also his amatory entanglements. The unfaithful Lucy Walter having retired on a pension, she had, among other successors, Elizabeth Killigrew and Catherine Peg, by both of whom he had children, whom he subsequently provided for in his customary sumptuous fashion. Accustomed to his father's conscientiousness and circumspection, Clarendon and Ormonde drew somewhat despondent inferences from the son's careless indiscretions, his "delight in empty, effeminate, and vulgar conversation," and latterly his indifferent interest in the various schemes for his restoration.

Meantime, his alliance with Spain gave no immediate promise of bettering his prospects. A rather fantastic scheme for an invasion of England came to naught, and he was further chagrined by the refusal of Don John to permit him to accompany him to the field. On pretence of visiting his brother at Dunkirk, he, however, managed to be present at the assault on Mardike, when Ormonde, who was riding with him, had a horse shot under him. The rout of the Spanish army at the Dunes, 4th June 1658, put an end to a project which Spain had never very seriously entertained; but within three months of this severe rebuff, Cromwell—the "powerful devil," against whose supremacy, abroad and at home, it seemed vain to contend—was where "the wicked cease from troubling" and "the weary are at rest." His death was not quite sudden, and unlike that of Charles I., there was nothing in the mode of its occurrence to shock or thrill the world. But the effect of his removal was uniquely comprehensive and profound. From the status of an obscure yeoman he had become the ascendant personality of his time. Never before had Europe witnessed such a wonderful and even portentous career; and next

to Napoleon he is, perhaps, the greatest military and political prodigy that in the later centuries has appeared in it. For some time he had exercised a kind of mesmeric effect on Europe's principalities and powers, as well as on the people in the three kingdoms under his personal rule; and on awakening from their trance, those who had been under its immediate spell were more or less bewildered.

Though in quite a different way, his death agitated Charles II. and his friends as much as had done the death of Charles I. The immensity of their relief, the rapture of their exultation transcended all expression. Yet, as Clarendon remarks, "contrary to all expectation, both at home and abroad, this earthquake was attended with no signal alteration." "Never monarch," he adds, "after he had inherited a crown of many descents, died in more silence or with less alteration, and there was the same or a greater calm in the kingdom than there had been before." But this was all mere seeming: the spell had been broken, though as yet this was hardly realised. The organisation he had left still continued, after a fashion, to perform its functions, but the animating and guiding force was gone, and derangement and stoppage could not be long deferred. His supremacy, established by superb military genius and the skill, renown and dread of a matchless personality, had no deeper root than in himself; it could not be transmitted to one less gifted and renowned; and his son Richard was merely a modest and mild nonentity.

Heedless of the excited impatience of the more hot-headed loyalists, Charles was phlegmatic and sapient enough not "to do any sudden thing." But from their point of view the situation was slow to improve. Even the peaceful, if ignominious, close of the Cromwellian dynasty by Richard's tame acquiescence in his super-

session by the Rump, enveloped their hopes in deep temporary gloom. And since both Monk—in command of the army in Scotland—and the navy declared adherence to this resurrected coterie of Independents, they themselves, notwithstanding their despicable past, “saw not how their empire could be shaken.”

But their arrogant self-sufficiency was their undoing. Their extreme rigour against the cavaliers stirred the loyalists into activity; and general derision was also aroused by the assurance with which this discarded tool of the great Protector was undertaking the task which had overtaxed his phenomenal if unscrupulous genius. Meanwhile, however, they possessed his perfected instrument, the army, and his organised system of watchful supervision; and thus they easily baffled a scheme for a simultaneous Royalist rising on 5th August. By the arrest of suspected persons the movement was frustrated except in Cheshire, Lancashire, and North Wales; and though a large force representing these districts assembled under Sir George Booth and Sir Thomas Middleton, it was on the 19th easily defeated by Lambert at Nantwich.

On learning the disaster Charles, who had gone to Brittany to await eventualities, proceeded to Fontarabia in Spain, where Mazarin and Don Louis de Haro were met to discuss terms for a pacification between France and Spain, but from neither could he obtain the smallest promise of assistance. His fortunes had never been so low. “The best,” says Clarendon, “that he could now look for seemed a permission to remain in Flanders with a narrow assignation for his bread.” But already elements of rupture among those nominally in power were beginning to manifest themselves. The Rump’s jealousy of Lambert caused him to suspend their sittings and place himself at the head of a new military despotism; and he again was interfered with

by Monk, who, on 1st January 1660, had crossed the Tweed, leaving Scotland, like Adam, to the freedom of its own will. Nominally, Monk was for the Rump, and against him Lambert failed to gain support from his soldiers, who, rather than fight with their Round-head comrades, silently deserted him.

The immediate future of England seemed now to be in the hands of the Rump, supported by Monk; but Monk's relations with the Parliamentary party were peculiar. He had fought against them and been imprisoned; and had received his liberty from Cromwell, on condition of accepting a commission for service in Ireland. From that time there was none in whom Cromwell placed more entire trust; but "he had," says Clarendon, "no fumes of fanaticism to turn his head, nor any credit with, or dependence upon, any who were swayed by those trances"; and after Cromwell's death, he was "generally looked upon as a man more inclined to the king than any other in great authority, if he discovered it without too much loss or hazard."

The Rump now proposed to make themselves perpetual rulers of England by giving effect to a petition of Praise-God Barebones against either calling a new Parliament or permitting those members to sit excluded by Pride's purge, and making it incumbent on those holding office in State or Church to take an oath abjuring the king and all his family. This was too much for Monk to stomach; and having convened the members of the Rump, together with the excluded members, he caused his secretary to read a Declaration, in which while assuring them "in the presence of God" that he had nothing before his eyes "but God's glory," and the "settlement of those realms upon commonwealth foundations," and expressing the opinion that if the government "be monarchical in the State the Church must follow, and Prelacy be brought in,"—a condition

of things "which," he said, "those nations I know cannot bear"—he suggested that the "best they could do for the peace of the nations" was that "they go forthwith to sit together in Parliament."

Overborne by his authority and baffled by his professions, the Rump had no option but to accept the excluded members. Nor whatever were Monk's hopes or beliefs was he able to make events accord with his avowals. With the Presbyterians plotting against the Independents and the Independents bewildered, discredited, and fallen out amongst themselves, a loyalist triumph, peaceful or bloody, could not long be deferred. Then the confused and bewildering course of events during the last twenty years, and the social incubus of opinionated Puritanical repression had been silently producing an overwhelming Royalist reaction. The majority of the Convention Commons, which met on 25th April, was thus strongly loyalist; and even on the more doubtful members the reading, on 1st May, of the very prudent and considerate letters and Declaration of Charles produced a very favourable impression. To many the discovery that they had nothing to fear from his return must have been an inexpressible relief. "So universal a joy," says Clarendon, "was never seen within these walls"; and though there were some "far from delighted with the temper of the House, they had not the hardihood to appear less transported than the rest." As for Monk, his only duty was to see that the Parliament's behests were carried out.

On 8th May Charles was proclaimed king, and on the 23rd he embarked on the *Naseby*, which in the afternoon he re-named the *Charles II.*, altering at the same time the Puritan names of the ships in attendance on him. Later, on the quarter-deck, he related to the officers and courtiers the wonderful story of his escape

after Worcester. On the 26th he landed at Dover, where he was received by General Monk and presented by the mayor with a very rich Bible, which, with courteous cajolery, he declared was what "he loved above all things in the world." Then after a genial conversation with General and Mrs Monk—the lady had been active in superintending the preparation of the palaces for his reception, and with characteristic tact he had specially invited her to meet him—and other dignitaries, he, "amidst shouting and joy," expressed "past imagination" by all, entered a state coach and set off towards Canterbury.

On the 29th he made his entry into London, "the bells ringing, the streets hung with tapestry, the fountains running with wine." Following the strange events of the previous twenty years, it was one of the most astonishing sights that that ancient and renowned city ever witnessed. The pious Royalist, Evelyn, who, in a kind of ecstatic wonder, stood beholding the procession in the Strand, could liken the event to nothing less divinely marvellous than "the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity." The memory of the bloody civil war seemed obliterated; the Cromwellian domination had disappeared like an evil dream; the resuscitated Rump had ignominiously expired without a tear of regret; and the ancient loyalty to the sovereign had reasserted itself in a manner beyond all antecedent expectation. It had stilled the voices of faction and superseded them by harmonious shouts of almost delirious acclamation. So irrepressible and apparently universal was the joy that Charles, in his witty fashion, remarked smilingly to some about him: "He doubted it had been his own fault he had been absent so long; for he saw nobody that had not protested he had ever wished his return."

CHAPTER XII.

CHARLES II.—UNTIL THE FALL OF CLARENDON.

WITH all his faults and failings, and partly by reason of them, Charles II. was peculiarly suited with the *rôle* of the Restoration king. If it needed the temperamental defects and strong and narrow convictions of his father to bring about the expulsion of the sovereignty, and if without the special and outstanding genius of Cromwell the temporary Puritan domination would have been impossible, the possibility and the success of the Restoration was largely due to the tact and temper of Charles II. His utter contrast in manner and disposition with his father was greatly in his favour. His careless good nature disarmed suspicion as to his absolutist tendencies; and his readiness to forget and forgive the past tended to create a certain feeling of gratitude in many who had reason to dread the consequences of a Royalist Restoration. Even if his excessive devotion to pleasure did much to handicap him as a sovereign, there was the counter-balancing advantage that he lacked his father's inconsiderate earnestness. Then the preceding succession of tragedies and misfortunes had quite transformed the situation. The social yoke of Puritanism was broken, broken for ever; even within its own peculiar spheres its operation was to be more and more tempered by

practical common-sense and the varied influence of agencies outside its limited confines. Meanwhile England, and especially London, was now visited with a great wave of reaction against it; and Charles II., in his tastes, manners, gaiety, careless good humour, sensuousness and strong zest for pleasure, was a kind of personal embodiment of that reaction.

The first care of Charles was to make certain of Monk by a dukedom, the chief command of the forces, and large grants of money and estates; and then to disband his troops, with the exception of a few regiments to form the possible nucleus of a new army. Monk was chosen a member of the special Committee of Council, the others being Monk's friend Morrice, Secretary of State; Hyde (created Earl of Clarendon), Lord Chancellor; Manchester, Lord Chamberlain; Ormonde, Lord Stewart; Nicholas, Secretary; and Southampton, Lord Treasurer, the chief management of affairs being delegated to Clarendon.

The first matter of importance was Indemnity. When the Lords sought to limit the scope of the bill, Charles intervened to insist that, in accordance with his Declaration, indemnity should be granted to all not immediately concerned in his father's murder. But he did not demur to the bill of 1660 for the attainder of Cromwell and the regicides, nor to the brutal resolution of the Commons "that the carcasses of those devils who were buried in Westminster—Cromwell, Bradshaw and Ireton—might be turned out of their graves, dragged to Tyburn, there to hang some time, and afterwards be buried under the gallows."

The Restoration settlement confirmed all the Acts, which, however much against his will, had received the sanction of Charles I., whilst all the legislation of the Cromwellian *régime* was deemed null and void, although the Navigation Acts and those dealing with wardships

were in substance adhered to. But in one respect—the cardinal character of which is not always sufficiently recognised—the constitutional position of Charles II. differed radically from that of his father: *he had not given, nor was asked to give, the Parliament control over its own dissolution*; for the nation had had more than enough of uncontrolled Parliaments. He had also the advantage of a definite income of £1,200,000 a year, including a life-grant of tonnage and poundage. Then the woeful failure of the heroic attempts to construct a constitution in which kingship—“as unnecessary, burdensome and dangerous”—was to have no place, conferred on him a great constitutional advantage. If to him his peaceful recall was an immense gratification, it was, on the nation's part, a signal act of repentance—a repentance which meanwhile had largely restored the lustre of the ancient sovereignty.

Even in Ireland—owing to detested memories of Cromwell's ruthlessness—the Restoration was welcomed by the native population with at least much negative enthusiasm. The establishment of Episcopacy was resented by the Ulster Presbyterians, but they were treated with some consideration; while the Catholic population recognised with gratitude the leniency extended towards them, even before Charles, during the latter period of his reign, began to favour a kind of Catholic ascendancy. The land confiscations of Cromwell could not be undone; the readjustments that were made were an unsatisfactory compromise; but although also an Act of 1666, prohibiting the importation into England of Irish live stock and of Irish beef, mutton and pork, was a hard blow to the country's agriculture, this was partly atoned for by Ormonde's enlightened encouragement of the woollen and linen manufacture; and ultimately the industrial

condition of the country became more satisfactory under Charles II. than ever before.

Scotland's case had a special singularity. There, some ten years previously, Charles had undergone his weird experiences as the captive sovereign of the Covenanters; and after an ordeal of declarations, oaths, mournings and false professions had been crowned king at Scone. England had now homologated Scotland's action but not on her terms. Whatever he might be in Scotland, Charles would plainly never in England be a Covenanted king. Yet the manifestations of joy at his Restoration were quite as frantic in Scotland as in England. How to account for this? One reason was doubtless relief from the bitter humiliation of the Cromwellian domination, and satisfaction at the formal recovery of national independence. Then while the Stewarts represented a Scottish dynasty, Charles had also himself won much popular attachment in Scotland; and further, the Covenant was not now in such high esteem in Scotland as it had been. In the end its career had been far from a triumphant one; and the extravagances of the extremists had brought it into partial discredit. The extremists were, it may be, more obsessed with a sense of their own and its importance than ever; but they were not of such account as they had been. If to them the Restoration of Charles II. must have seemed a more than questionable event, they were not in a position to gainsay it; they had not even any candidate of their own for the sovereignty; and having no option but merely to turn him to the best account they could, they sought to draw up a petition on behalf of the establishment of Presbyterianism throughout his dominions; but in this they were frustrated by the Committee of Estates, and evidently the old Covenanting temper of the nation had greatly moderated. A

considerable number, especially among the gentry, may, on the whole, have preferred the less severe *régime* of Episcopacy, and many more may have had no strong objections to it. Still, had Charles decided for undiluted Presbyterianism he would have gratified the bulk of the nation. But then the relations between the Stewart sovereigns and Scottish Presbyterianism had never been happy; and his own experiences of its tender mercies could hardly have prejudiced him in its favour. Its attitude to the sovereign had been that of overbearing arrogance; and, all things considered, it is not surprising that Charles II., strongly disposed though he was towards ecclesiastical conciliation, and even to grant the Presbyterians a kind of State recognition in England, resolved in Scotland "to preserve the Church as settled by law," that is, by the laws of James VI. and Charles I.; for an Act of Rescission was framed annulling the proceedings of any Parliament since 1633.

In view of the previous violent resistance to Episcopacy, the general passivity with which this announcement—and even the burning of the Covenant by the common hangman—was received, indicated a striking decline in Covenanting ardour. The indifference shown to the execution of Argyll, Johnstone of Warriston, and James Guthrie might be accounted for by party contentions; but the indignity done to the very Covenant would, in days of yore, have aroused national execration as at a sacrilegious outrage. Having thus lost much of its old glamour, the Covenant in Scottish tradition might have had a somewhat different reputation than it now has but for an enactment of 11th June 1662, that all ministers ordained since the abolition of the law of patronage in 1649 must receive their presentation from their lawful patron and collation from their bishops, or demit their cures. If, considering the char-

acter of the times and of the Covenanting tenets—in their political bearing—the enactment can hardly be termed a political crime, it turned out to be, so far as can be judged, a rather serious blunder, and involved a course of action more or less ignominious. But for this special provocation, the extreme Covenanting fanaticism might have gradually subsided; but now, though the bulk of the clergy concerned conformed, a large majority in the south and south-west declined to do so; and their resolve, supported by their peasant congregations, led to the great Covenanting persecution. The partly discredited Covenant thus acquired a new lustre, through its association with the heroic sufferings and martyrdoms of those, who were still prepared to deny to their fellow-Christians the ecclesiastical liberty they were claiming for themselves. At first an attempt was made to enforce attendance on the ministrations of the presentees by heavy fines, but after the Pentland rising more drastic measures were gradually adopted; and on account of the strenuous Covenanting resistance they were increased in severity year by year: confiscation, torture, transportation and summary execution being all had recourse to. There is evidence that Charles did not wholly approve of the extreme severities of his officials. Had he been on the spot they could hardly have happened; but he saw Scotland through his own experiences of it as a Covenanted king; he neither knew the greatness of the general decline of the Covenanting influence, nor, culpably careless in regard to administrative details, was he fully informed of the worst features of the persecution.

The new English Parliament, which, in May 1661, succeeded the convention one, was even embarrassingly loyalist; it was described as “full of lewd young men, chosen by a furious people to spite the Puritans, whose severity had distasted them.” The lewd young men

began by piously imposing the sacrament on themselves and their fellow-members, and restoring the bishops to their seats in the House of Lords. This was followed by the Corporation Act, which, with a certain show of reason, compelled those who held office to express their abhorrence of taking up arms against the king, and to declare the Covenant null and unlawful, but, further, required them, within a year of their election, to receive the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England. In a Declaration on ecclesiastical affairs, issued on 25th October 1660, Charles had expressed his strong desire for an arrangement which would permit the retention of Presbyterians within the Church of England; but the bill failed to pass in the convention Parliament; and now, on 19th May 1662, was passed the Act of Uniformity, which, besides imposing similar oaths on all persons in Holy Orders, holders of university offices, schoolmasters and private tutors, required the unfeigned assent of all classes to the Book of Common Prayer, and declared all non-Episcopal orders invalid. As a result of the Act 2000 clergymen were ejected from their livings. It was a great hardship, though the character of the hardship has been misunderstood: they had been usurping the places of the Episcopal clergy, expelled under the Cromwellian *régime*.

This extreme legislation was displeasing to Charles. He had no Protestant Episcopal prepossessions; he was quite the reverse of a religious zealot. "Both at prayers and sermons," records Burnet, "he, as it were, took care to satisfy people that he was in no sort concerned in that about which he was employed." Writing to his sister, Henrietta Maria, he remarks: "We have the same disease of sermons that you complain of there, but I hope you have the same convenience that the rest of the family has of sleeping much of the time,

which is a great ease to those who are bound to hear them." He was, he told Burnet, "no Atheist, but he would not think God would make a man miserable only for taking a little pleasure out of the way." Just before the Restoration he indirectly caused France and Spain to suppose that he was a Catholic; and he made no secret of his political preference for Catholicism, under which, he said, "government was a much safer and easier thing." But he was, above all, an opportunist; and Protestantism having acquired such a hold on the English nation, what he was mainly anxious for was a kind of ecclesiastical harmony that would permit him to be on the best of terms with his subjects. The Restoration thus witnessed an entire reversal of the ecclesiastical situation in the time of Charles I. It was now the king who stood for religious toleration, and the Parliament who championed intolerant Episcopacy.

In striking contrast with his father's policy he sought to mitigate the hardships of the Act of Uniformity by exempting from it those of the clergy whose sole objection was to the wearing of the surplice and the use of the cross at baptism; but his suggestion, while accepted by the Lords, was rejected by the Commons, nor could he even win consent to the suppression of the Act for three months. On 26th December he therefore issued a Declaration, proposing to ask Parliament to concur with him to pass an Act "which would enable him to exercise with a more universal satisfaction that power of dispensation which he conceived to be inherent in him." The bill, though opposed by Clarendon, was read twice by the Lords, who, however, limited its operation to Protestant Nonconformity, while the Commons objected even to this as tending to establish schism by law, and both Houses petitioned him for the enforcement of the laws against the Catholics. There-

upon he prorogued the Parliament, but being in need of supplies for the Dutch War, he assented in 1664 to the first Conventicle Act, which forbade under severe penalties the meeting of more than five persons besides the household for religious services other than those sanctioned by the Church; and he completed his surrender by assenting to the Five-Mile Act, forbidding any Nonconformist minister to teach in schools, or to come within five miles of any market town or place where he used to minister, unless he took an oath henceforth not "to endeavour any alteration of government either in Church or State." It being, however, notorious that Charles was opposed to this intolerant legislation, he, notwithstanding his far from decorous course of life, continued to retain Nonconformist goodwill.

Partly influenced by the persuasion and bribes of Louis XIV., Charles, on 23rd June 1661, signed a treaty of marriage to the Infanta Catherine of Braganza, in which he agreed to assist Portugal in achieving her independence by a force of 2000 foot, 1000 horse, and 10 ships of war, on condition of obtaining Tangier and Bombay and important commercial privileges, while the marriage dowry amounted to two million cruzados. Though not influenced by Protestant ambitions, the policy thus inaugurated was partly a return to that of Cromwell; but while it commended itself by its commercial advantages, to which Charles always attached great account, it was also largely dictated by personal pecuniary considerations. From Louis XIV. he received a secret grant of £80,000, and publicly £200,000, to part with Dunkirk. The relations with France were further strengthened by the marriage of Charles's favourite sister, the Princess Henrietta, to the Duke of Orleans, brother of Louis XIV.

Had Charles married Henriette of Orange, to whom

he made an offer of his hand shortly after the death of Cromwell, it is conceivable that his domestic life would have been more satisfactory, especially had the marriage been blessed with children. It would seem that Charles had been finally led to decide on Catherine of Braganza by the very flattering portrait of her which had been sent him. Of several German princesses that had been mentioned to him he had remarked, "Odds fish! they are all dull and foggy"; but we may suppose that most of them were in personal charms the equal of the Portuguese Infanta. Low of stature, squat of figure, and of brown complexion, with "fore-teeth standing out so as to shorten her upper lip," with no cultivated graces or attractions, and clad in a bizarre Portuguese costume, she ludicrously disappointed the king's expectations. He thought "they had brought him a bat instead of a woman; but it was too late to find fault, and he must make the best he could of a bad matter." Later he wrote to Clarendon: "Her face is not so exact as to be called beauty, though her eyes are excellent good, and there is nothing in her face that in the least can disgust one." Pepys describes her as not overcharming, but having "a good and innocent look that is pleasing"; and Charles himself affirmed that if he had any skill in physiognomy, "she might be as good a woman as ever was born." But then Charles could never be enamoured of her; and he was still deeply enamoured—enamoured as he had never been of any previous mistress—of Louisa Palmer, Countess of Castlemaine, whom Reresby describes as "the finest woman of her age." The countess was also determined that she should in no way suffer by the new connection; and probably gave Charles no option than to insist on the queen accepting her as one of the ladies of her bedchamber. On, however, the name appearing in the list, the queen scratched it

out; and when, a few days afterwards, Charles presented the countess to her at court, she at first received her graciously, "but the instant she knew who she was she was no sooner set in her chair, but her colour changed and she fainted." Unpleasant and violent scenes followed, but Charles was quite set on establishing his mistress at the court. "I wish," he wrote to Clarendon, "I may be unhappy in this world and the world to come, if I fail in the least degree of what I have resolved, which is of making my Lady Castlemaine of my wife's bedchamber, and whoever I find use any endeavour to hinder this resolution of mine (except it be to myself), I will be his enemy to the last moment of his life." Though he sought to persuade Charles against it, Clarendon was induced to be his agent in seeking to prevail upon Catherine to accede to his wishes. At first she met all overtures with tears of rage and vexation; but when Lady Castlemaine took up her residence at Hampton Court, she "of a sudden let herself fall into conversation, and then to familiarity, and even in the same instant to confidence with the lady: was merry with her in public, talked kindly of her, and in private nobody used her more friendly." She lacked the countess's strength of will; and as passionately fond of gaiety as the merry society in which she found herself, the pleasant kindness of Charles, after the quarrel was over, helped her "to make," as Charles put it of himself, "the best of a bad matter." The countess was also on terms of friendly intimacy with Henrietta Maria. Of a visit to the queen-mother, Pepys chronicles: "Here I saw, also, Madame Castlemaine, and, which pleased me most, Mr Crofts, the king's bastard [by Lucy Walter, and better known as the Duke of Monmouth], a most pretty spark of about fifteen years old, who I perceived hung much upon my

Lady Castlemaine, and I hear the queens both are mighty kind to him."

For some time Lady Castlemaine remained the queen's only rival. From the time of his Restoration, Charles, if we are to believe Pepys, had not kept more than one mistress. Not till the advent at court of Frances Stewart—daughter of Walter Stewart, son of Lord Blantyre—was the lustre of Lady Castlemaine eclipsed. Though quite destitute of talent, and according to the Grammont *Memoirs*, in every respect a mere child, except playing with a doll, she was both in face and form deemed the handsomest of all the court beauties; so much so that her figure was chosen to represent Britannia upon the current coins. The king is supposed to have entertained a deeper affection for her than any other woman. Though he is said to have remarked to her he hoped he would live to see her "ugly and willing," her resistance to his advances inspired him with a certain special regard for her self-respect, and he is even said to have contemplated a divorce from the queen that he might marry her. It was after her marriage, much to his chagrin, to the Duke of Richmond in 1667, that he began his career of miscellaneous intrigues with the stage-dancer Moll Davies, the sprightly Nell Gwynne, a comic actress named Knight, and various other women. Lady Castlemaine, created Duchess of Cleveland, had ceased to have any hold of him except through her children and her irrepressibility. Latterly she was superseded as mistress-in-chief by the French lady, Louise de Kerouaille, created Duchess of Portsmouth, whose surrender—if so it can be called—was accomplished in March 1671 at Eaton Hall, Suffolk, through the connivance of the Countess of Arlington. On the following Sunday "a young Cambridge divine," says Evelyn, "preached an excellent sermon in the chapel, the king

and the Duke of York being present." Later, the Duchess of Portsmouth's supremacy seemed to be threatened by Hortense Mancini, Duchess of Mazarin, with whom, before the Restoration, Charles had proposals of marriage. It did not suffer eclipse; but throughout the changing fortunes of aristocratic favourites and the succession of minor mistresses, the pert and witty Nell Gwynne succeeded in keeping a firm hold on his good nature. "Kerouaille," wrote Madame de Sévigné, "is powerless to detain him from his comedian. He divides his money, his time, and his health between the pair. The low actress is as proud as the Duchess of Portsmouth, whom she jeers at, mimics, and makes game of. She braves her to her face, and often takes the king away from her, and boasts she is the best loved of the two. She is young, of madcap gaiety, bold, brazen, and ready-witted." The model Evelyn, walking through St James's Park, 10th May 1671, was the regretful witness of a characteristic battle of wits between the merry monarch and "Miss Nell, as they call an impudent comedian, she looking out of her garden on a terrace at the top of the wall, and he in the green walk under it."

In the court of Charles II. gaiety and frivolity acquired an undisputed predominance. This may be partly accounted for by the habits formed by Charles and his court while abroad, when there was little but trifles to occupy their attention; and it was also closely associated with the general reaction against Puritanism, which tended to create, especially amongst the upper classes, a certain mad revolt against every kind of conventional restraint. Seriousness was entirely at a discount, and levity became transformed into a kind of supreme virtue. In the more riotous revels and excesses Charles, however, had no share. Though instances of his being maudlin are recorded, they

occurred but seldom : on various occasions he expressed his strong disapproval of drunken excesses. His outstanding weaknesses were his inordinate subjection to his mistresses and his complete lack of control over money. His enormous extravagance may be partly accounted for by his chronic poverty when in exile. At the time of the Restoration he was even in such pecuniary straits that his clothes and those of his attendants were in a sad state of disrepair. When Sir John Greville brought him some money, "so joyful was he," says Pepys, "that he called the Princess Royal and Duke of York to look upon it as it lay in the portmanteau before it was taken out." The sudden change from almost abject poverty to sovereignty and an income of more than a million, seems to have made him revel in mere prodigality ; and money slipped from him with so magical a swiftness that, after a fashion, he came to be as hard up when on a throne as during the worst days of his exile. Apart, however, from his excesses in love and his careless extravagances, he had no lack of self-control. Though, according to Wellwood, "he was glad to win a little money at play, and impatient to lose the thousandth part of what within an hour after he would throw away in gross," gambling did not become with him, as with many at the court, an absorbing infatuation. His listlessness and laziness have also been much exaggerated. He did not spend the bulk of his time in toying with his mistresses, or his spaniels, or feeding the ducks in St James's Park. Soon after his arrival in England he was reported by Pepys to be tiring "all his people that were about him with his early rising." When in town he was almost daily in the tennis-courts, winter and summer, as soon as daylight. He occasionally enjoyed the sport of Isaac Walton on the Thames at Datchet ; like his grandfather, James I., he was a

devoted follower of the chase; and when tennis, fishing, or hunting was not available, it was his custom to walk for three or four hours, "which he did commonly so fast that, as it was really an exercise to himself, so it was a trouble to all about him to hold up with him." One of the most accomplished horsemen of his time, he did more than revive the Newmarket glories of his grandfather. By the importation of Arabs he began the creation of the type of racer of the present day; and his enthusiasm for the sport frequently induced him to mount his own horses, on whom he won several plates. At Newmarket there were also athletic and other sports and amusements to occupy his casual attention. "The king," narrates Reresby, "was much pleased with the country, and so great a lover of the diversions which that place did afford, that he let himself down from majesty to the very degree of a country gentleman. He mixed himself amongst the crowd, allowed every man to speak to him that pleased; went a-hawking in the morning, to cock matches in the afternoon (if there were no horse races), and to plays in the evening, acted in a barn, and by very ordinary Bartholomew comedians." His courteous affability was, indeed, one of the main sources of his general popularity. He was reputed one of the best bred men of his time. "Never prince," says Wellwood, "loved ceremony less, or despised the pageantry of a crown more; yet he was master of something in his person and aspect that commanded both love and veneration at once." Those who presumed on his good nature were certain to find themselves mistaken. His opinions about both men and women were, in fact, somewhat cynical; but it must be said that he had exceptional opportunities for discovering the frailties of human nature. His own selfishness had also from his early years been very strongly nurtured; and it says some-

thing for him that he was able to retain throughout his varied social and political adventures so exhaustless a supply of good nature, though "none of the firmest or most grateful of friends."

During the Puritan supremacy play-acting had been under a ban, but hard on the arrival of Charles in London two theatres were established, one for the King's company in Drury Lane, and one for the Duke of York's in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Attendance at the play had been one of the favourite diversions of Charles when abroad, and he manifested a special interest in the theatrical arrangements. On the revival of Ben Jonson's *Catiline*, he supplied £500 for the purchase of the necessary robes. "A good new comedy," it was said, "took the next place in the king's liking after his latest new mistress." At first the theatres depended on the revival of the old plays, and many of the old stock pieces retained their place after the new plays became more common. The Restoration witnessed a great improvement in scenery, dresses, and the character of the accommodation. On 3rd January 1660-1, Pepys, also, for the first time saw women come upon the stage. Generally, however, it may be said that the new dramatic school of the Restoration was, compared with the older one, shallow and trifling. The intervention of Puritanism had, in a manner, severed the old dramatic tradition, and the new drama mirrored largely the reaction against Puritanism. Its tragedy was often merely absurd bombast, and the best of it was lacking in high pathetic appeal, and dependent for its effect mainly on the grandiose representation of lurid and exciting incidents; while its comedy, though not devoid of sparkling cleverness, was pervaded and degraded by coarseness. Partly modelled on the contemporary French drama, it lacked its deftness of touch; its temper was grosser, its jocosity rougher

and muddier. The French drama was pervaded by a certain deference to the ancient sentiments of chivalry and honour. The early English Restoration drama mirrored the peculiar Restoration lewdness and licence. It was shrewd, trenchant, and exceedingly candid, but its wit was often too rudely indelicate, and its tone too monotonously cynical.

Charles had also certain artistic proclivities. He possessed musical tastes; and besides having his band of four-and-twenty fiddlers to play before him at meals, had occasional concerts in the Boarded Gallery at Whitehall, where, records the artless Pepys, "the manner of setting of words and repeating them out of order, and that with a number of voices, makes me sick, the whole design of vocal music being lost by it." Though not so accomplished a connoisseur as his father, he was a great collector of pictures, miniatures, and curios. In his closet, Pepys "saw such a variety of pictures and other things of value and rarity," that he was "properly confounded, and enjoyed no pleasure in the sight of them." Lely, who had the unique privilege of depicting the rugged features of Cromwell, devoted, under the patronage of the Restoration king, his later years to portraying the charms of the Caroline maids of honour. The two Vanderveldes were engaged, each at a yearly salary of £200, to collaborate in painting sea pictures. Verrio was employed to decorate Windsor Castle, and Orlando Gibbons, appointed master carver in wood to the crown, has left specimens of his art in the palaces of Whitehall, Windsor, and Kensington. The king's interest in planting and building, of which Evelyn makes mention, was more particularly shown in the adornment of Greenwich Park with trees and shrubs, the re-erection of the palace there, and the construction of a palace at Winchester. On the night before his fatal illness he

promised Ailesbury to take him to Winchester the very next time he went down to show him, he said, "the place I so delight in." By his sudden death a remark of his called forth by his impatience to see it completed, acquired a pathetic significance: "A year," he said, "was a great time in his life."

But the tastes of Charles were more luxurious than strictly artistic. His mental bent was mainly scientific. He was a strong materialist. Halifax states that he had a mechanical head, which appeared in his inclination to shipping, fortification, &c.; and Burnet, in his carping fashion, remarks that he "knew the architecture of ships so perfectly that, in that respect, he was exact rather more than became a prince." Pepys mentions his absorbed curiosity in witnessing the dissection of two bodies. He had a laboratory of his own in which he spent much time in company with Sir Robert Moray, the President of the Royal Society, founded in 1662, in which Charles took an active interest. He also instituted the Observatory at Greenwich, and a mathematical school at Christ's Hospital.

The great natural abilities of Charles were, however, more particularly manifested in his contact with his fellows. In social intercourse he had a certain pre-eminence even apart from his sovereignty. In wit and discernment he was a match for any of the clever men and women of his singular court. "When," says Well-wood, "he had a mind to lay aside the king, which he often did in select companies of his own, there were a thousand irresistible charms in his conversation." "He was witty," records Buckingham, "in all sorts of conversation; and telling a story so well that, not only out of flattery, but for the pleasure in hearing it, we used to seem ignorant of what he had repeated to us ten times before, as a good comedy will bear to be

seen often." Sir William Temple affirms that "when he was pleased to be familiar," he showed "great quickness of conception, great pleasantness of wit, with great variety of knowledge, more observation and true judgment of men than one would have imagined by so careless and easy a manner as was natural to him in all he said or did." According to Lord Keeper Guildford, by his personal intercourse with ambassadors and others, he got to understand foreign affairs better than all his council and counsellors put together.

These various sidelights on Charles II. combine to bear out a statement of Halifax that "he was far from a common type of man." His personality was foreign more than English; and it largely evades appraisal by current formulas. His very exceptional gifts are undeniable, that he largely misused them is equally undeniable; but his circumstances had all along been exceptional. For his lack of devotion to business, Clarendon blames "partly the unhappy temper and constitution of the House of Commons," which "did so break his spirit that he grew more disposed to leave all things to their natural course and God's providence." At the same time, he was much more interested in affairs, so far at least as they bore on his own well-being, than he pretended, though he gave himself no more trouble about anything than he could help. "Amidst all his remissness," he was, Buckingham tells us, "so industrious and indefatigable on some particular occasions that no man would either toil longer or be able to manage better"; and Wellwood says that "he would often, by fits and starts, outdo his Ministers in diligence." Our acquaintance with features of his reign, not known to these observers, renders this testimony easily credible. But then it has to be added that his interest in affairs was a peculiar one. It became more and more self-centred. This arose

partly from the manner in which he was thwarted by refractory Parliaments, but also from long-contracted habits of selfishness and augmenting impecuniosity caused by the greed of his various mistresses and by other extravagances. He was able, skilful, and, after a fashion, well meaning; but partly demoralised. His political demoralisation evidenced itself more particularly in his pecuniary relations with Louis XIV., the disgrace of which was all the deeper if Louis was more his dupe than he was the dupe of Louis. Thus, though a much abler, more practical, and, in a sense, more enlightened ruler than his father or grandfather, he was a much more unprincipled one. In their sovereignties there are no such glimpses of masterly ability as are now and again revealed in his; and he never, like them, allowed himself to become the victim of ideals or the dupe of will-o'-the-wisps; but then there are qualities in his political conduct that arouse a deeper disapprobation.

His attitude to the Dutch war was characteristic. Apart from his relations with Louis, he seems to have been convinced—as he privately affirmed—of its un wisdom. But he did not oppose the general enthusiasm for it, and merely sought to minimise its diplomatic dangers. By a treaty of 1662 Louis was pledged to aid the Dutch, provided they were not the aggressors. Charles sought to persuade him that they rather than the English were the aggressors, and had it suited Louis to accept the plea he would have done so; but, in view of his claims, through his wife, on the Netherlands after the death of Philip IV., he wished to be on good terms with the Dutch. Still, a rupture with England was inadvisable, and though, in January 1664, he declared war against her, his aim was to convince her of the advisability of making peace. The forces of England's ally, the Bishop of Münster, were driven out

of Holland by the French, after which the bishop, on 18th April 1666, made peace with France. Sweden, from whom England expected help, now remained neutral; and the formation, in October, of the Quadruple Alliance between Holland, Denmark, and Brunswick-Luneburg, left England completely isolated.

Nor did her maritime successes coincide with her hopes. They began with a brilliant victory off Lowestoft, 3rd June 1665; but on the 7th, Pepys, walking in the sweltering sunshine down Drury Lane, did "see two or three houses marked with a red cross upon the doors." Before, in the late October, the plague relaxed its clutch on London, 70,000 persons had succumbed, and its unprecedented ravages paralysed England's maritime activity. Next year the four days' battle, June 1-4 in the Downs, which ended in a technical Dutch victory, was followed on the 23rd by the successful action of Monk and Rupert; but England had little more than held her own; and with the outbreak, 2nd September 1666, of the great fire, which in four days reduced two-thirds of London to ashes, the war enthusiasm had wellnigh evaporated. Since also some money had been applied by the king to his private uses, negotiations for peace were in May 1667 begun at Breda. The English stipulated for the restoration of the Pularoon islands to the East India Company; but the Dutch, knowing England's unpreparedness, sailed up the Medway, and besides burning several ships, seized the *Royal Charles*. Though this caused much consternation both in the city and the court, the king, Burnet affirms, though Burnet was not there, "was very cheerful that night at supper with his mistresses," and he states that many libels were written, comparing him "to Nero, who was fiddling when Rome was burning"; but we know from Pepys that the king and the Duke of York had been down the river from

“four o’clock in the morning to command the sinking of ships at Barking-Creeke and other places to stop them coming up higher.” Evidently, also, the king was well aware of the real aim of the demonstration; and having previously made up his mind to grant the Dutch their conditions, he overlooked the affront, which he was not in a position to resent; and peace was signed on 21st July.

For England, the one signal consequence of the ineffectual war was the fall of Clarendon. There was general jealousy of his pre-eminence, and he had few devoted friends. While his extreme Anglicanism had aroused the bitter hatred of the Nonconformists and Catholics, his support of the Indemnity Bill had mortally offended the Cavaliers; and now his opposition to the supervision of the public expenditure exposed him to the wrath of the Commons. Nor was the king disposed to shield him. It may be that his loss of royal favour was due partly to his scorn of those whom Evelyn terms the “buffoons and ladies of pleasure”; but apart from this, the king could hardly afford to bear the burden of his unpopularity, and besides, he now found it needful to have a freedom of action with which a continuance of his close relations with Clarendon would seriously interfere.

CHAPTER XIII.

CHARLES II.—THE CABAL, THE POPISH TERROR, AND
THE TRIUMPH OF THE KING.

BUCKINGHAM and Arlington were now supposed to be the chief political confidants of Charles, and later he formed an inner council of five: Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley Cooper, and Lauderdale, whose joint initials suggested the application to them of the sinister term Cabal. Amongst other reasons for their choice was their support of his ecclesiastical policy. Arlington and Clifford, a *protégé* of Arlington's, were both Catholic royalists; Buckingham, whose baseness, as in the case of Lauderdale, was as conspicuous as his ability, had married the daughter of Fairfax, and, despite his extremely anti-Puritan morals, affected to patronise the Independents; Ashley Cooper, afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury, in the end to be a source of much trouble to Charles, was meanwhile favoured as an advocate of toleration; and Lauderdale—who had dispensed with his Covenanting convictions for the sake of power and pelf—was at the king's call for almost any political service. But all were mainly his unconscious tools. They were made use of to conceal rather than either to initiate or execute his political aims; to his sister he wrote that he followed always his own judgment, and

that if his Ministers "took any other course," they "would find themselves mistaken in the end."

The pivot on which, so to speak, the intricate evolution of the political strategy of Charles now began to turn was the situation created by the French invasion of the Netherlands. Professing dissatisfaction with the overtures of France on points that concerned the trading privileges of England, he, on 23rd January 1668, concluded at the Hague what, after Sweden, in April, joined the Confederation of England and Holland, came to be known as the Triple Alliance. Thereupon Louis XIV. concluded with Spain, on 2nd May, the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, France retaining her conquests in the Netherlands, while ceding to Spain Franche Comté.

For Charles the main benefit of the Triple Alliance was its tactical advantage in raising his terms with Louis XIV. Though popular in England, it did not beget, on the part of the Commons, the pecuniary liberality which Charles may have partly hoped for, nor did it lessen their dictatorial tone in regard to tolerance or control over expenditure. To Louis Charles explained that the alliance did not imply anything really prejudicial to France; and expressed his strong desire "to execute it with every possible regard to your satisfaction," revealing to him, at the same time, the secret clause of the treaty by which the three Powers had agreed to combine to resist the further aggression of France. Personally he expressed his desire for a "strict alliance with France," but insisted on an arrangement for "securing the great and principal interests of this nation," . . . "which is trade." When this caused Louis to enter into communications with de Witt, Charles made a quite startling diversion by, on 25th January 1669, appointing a private conference in the Duke of York's closet, with Arlington, Clifford,

and Lord Arundel of Wardour, when, so it is recorded in Clarke's *Life of James II.*, he, "with tears in his eyes," made known to them his affliction in "not being able to profess the faith he believed," and his desire to consult them "about the ways and methods fittest to be taken for the settlement of the Catholic religion in his kingdom." This, it was resolved, could best be done in conjunction with France. Negotiations were entered into with Louis; but the story that Charles did, at any time, enter into communication with the General of the Jesuits depended upon the acceptance of certain letters attributed to him, the authenticity of which cannot now be admitted.

That Charles did hanker after the establishment of a kind of modified Catholicism is undeniable, but that he had a deep personal interest in Catholicism is far from evident, and that he now seriously contemplated establishing it by French aid is hardly credible. He quite lacked the obtuse assertiveness of his brother, even if to profess a faith, to flaunt an ecclesiastical banner, had been to him a matter of prime moment. Much of his purpose in proposing to Louis the Catholicising of Britain might be served, if he convinced him of his Catholic sympathies and of his sincere desire for his alliance. Louis, again, was not consumed with any strong desire to aid Charles in his Catholic crusade. He had other purposes in view with which it could not be permitted to interfere, and for which it was advisable to be assured of the support of Charles.

In his negotiations with Louis Charles made use of his favourite sister Henrietta, or it might be put that Louis made use of her. As the result of this, partly indirect, exchange of views between the two kings, the secret Treaty of Dover was signed, 22nd May 1670, by Colbert for France and by Arlington, Clifford, Arundel, and Bellings for England. At a time convenient for

himself Charles was to declare his adherence to Catholicism, and at a time convenient for himself Louis was to aid him, if necessary, with a force of 6000 for its restoration in England. But the prime purpose of Louis was to secure the alliance of England against Holland, and the prime need of Charles was a supply of ready money. The establishment of a Catholic absolutism in England was indefinitely postponed, but Charles was to receive from Louis £150,000 to meet the problematic expenses that might be caused by the publication of his conversion; and while he undertook to aid Louis against Holland with 6000 men and 50 ships of war, Louis, besides the expense of their maintenance, was to pay him an annual stipend of £250,000 while the war lasted. To mask the secret treaty, another, the *Traite simulée*, making no mention of the Catholic projects, was signed on 31st December.

Meantime, by assenting, in April 1670, to the cruel Conventicle Act, Charles obtained a vote of £300,000 for eight years; and by a deceptive speech to the Parliament in October, he induced the Commons to pass a special vote of £800,000, virtually on behalf of the objects of the Triple Alliance. In the following March he obtained a further supply by actually assenting to a proclamation against the Papists, after which he prorogued the Parliament till 4th February 1672-3. But since all these devices did not procure him sufficient supplies for his enormous necessities, he, on 3rd January 1672-3, stopped for a year the payment of loans, amounting then to £1,300,000, which the London bankers were accustomed to advance to the Exchequer, on condition of repayment with interest as the taxes came in. With this in hand, he cancelled both the Conventicle Act and the Anti-Papal Proclamation by issuing a Declaration of Indulgence, suspending "all manner of penal laws in matters ecclesiastical against whatever sort of Noncon-

formist or recreant," and, two days later, war was declared against the Dutch.

Since the Dutch hopes of Louis were more than disappointed, the Catholic schemes of Charles, real or fictitious, did not figure further even in diplomacy. The Dutch war was also to have consequences virtually affecting not merely the fortunes of Louis and France, but the destinies of England and the House of Stewart. The overwhelming French advance roused, amongst the Dutch, such indignation against De Witt, that, on 20th April 1672, he was murdered by the mob in front of the palace of the States-General; and with his death the eyes of the nation turned towards William of Orange, who—after the opening of the Dutch sea-dykes compelled the victorious French to save themselves from destruction by a precipitate retreat—was able to complete an alliance with Spain and Austria against the invaders.

In his speech at the opening of Parliament in February 1672-3, Charles, besides asking for supplies for a continuance of the war, enlarged on the beneficial effects of the Declaration of Indulgence; but the Commons replied by a resolution that Penal Statutes in matters ecclesiastical cannot be suspended but by an Act of Parliament, and supplemented this by the bigoted Test Act, making it incumbent on every one in a civil or military office to take the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England. Though Louis strongly urged him to humour the Commons, and though his consent meant a grant of £1,500,000, he yielded with the strongest reluctance. It involved the dissolution of the Cabal, and—though Louis did not dream of this—it brought about peace between England and Holland. But for the conscientiousness of the Duke of York—"la sottise de mon frère," Charles termed it to Ruvigny—in declining to take the sacra-

ment according to the rites of the Church of England, it might not have done so. The implied Catholicism of the Duke, followed by his marriage—at the urgent suggestion of Louis XIV., whose eyes were on the future—to Mary of Modena, so strengthened the Anti-French sentiment in the Commons, that Charles had hardly other option than to consent, on 9th February 1674, to the Peace of Westminster.

A new phase of the sovereignty of Charles now began to manifest itself. The charge of domestic affairs was entrusted to Sir Thomas Osborne, made Lord Treasurer and created Lord Danby, whose financial reforms helped the chronic impecuniosity of Charles. With the tacit consent of Charles, he also reverted, in part, to the policy of Clarendon. He sought to rally the Cavalier party round the throne by (1) allowing full scope to their intolerant Anglicanism, and (2) by wholesale bribery and distribution of offices and favours on strictly party lines, as still largely prevails without any realisation of its essential corruptness. To Danby may be assigned the organisation of what came to be known as the Tory party, just as Shaftesbury—who, 2nd December 1673, had been dismissed from the Chancellorship—may be deemed the chief begetter of that variety of politician on whom was bestowed the epithet “Whig.”

After the assembling of Parliament, in August 1675, Charles was induced by Danby to publish a proclamation against Nonconformity. This was preparatory to a Non-resistance Bill, exacting from all holders of office and from members of both Houses of Parliament a declaration that to take up arms against the king, “on any pretence whatever,” was unlawful, and an oath never to attempt any alteration in government or religion, “not established by law”; but on account of the opposition to the bill in the Lords by Buckingham

and Shaftesbury, and a quarrel between the Lords and Commons on a point of privilege, it was not persevered in.

Desiring to retain his French stipend, Charles, notwithstanding the Peace of Westminster, continued to give Louis what may be termed his moral support and a certain amount of help, which violated the spirit, if not the letter of the treaty. The English troops in the French service were not recalled, and special facilities were granted for recruiting in England and Ireland. But uneasy at the dominance of Danby, Louis sought to combat the Anti-French sentiment in the Commons by lavish bribes, distributed through Shaftesbury and the Duke of York. On these efforts he could, however, place small reliance unless he made sure of Charles, whose aim, again, was to play off Louis against the Parliament and it against Louis, so as to obtain as much from both as he could. Unable to make much headway by bribing the Commons, Louis in September offered Charles a grant of £100,000 a-year on condition that he dissolved Parliament should it propose to take any hostile action against France. Charles prorogued it until February 1677; and on 16th February he entered into a secret compact with Louis that neither monarch should conclude a treaty with the Dutch or any other Power except by mutual consent.

Charles was now advantaged by a strange freak of Shaftesbury, who, founding on an obsolete statute of Edward III., enjoining annual Parliaments, moved that the present Parliament was no longer a lawful assembly. For this he and his principal supporters, Buckingham, Salisbury, and Wharton, were ordered to ask pardon of the House, and Shaftesbury proving recalcitrant was sent to the Tower, where he lay until February 1678. From the Commons Danby obtained a subsidy of £600,000; and "in all things," says Burnet, they were

“so compliant that the court had not, for many years, had so hopeful a session as this was.” “But all,” as he adds, was “changed of a sudden.” The success of the French campaign against the Prince of Orange caused such alarm that the king was urgently pressed to recall the troops serving in the French army, and even to declare war against France. So insistent became the clamour that, on 28th May, he was compelled to resent the interference of the Commons by proroguing the Parliament, in a speech in which he told them that the “fundamental power of making peace and war” was an “essential part of monarchy.” The prorogation was, however, only until July, for the aim of Charles was a profitable bargain with Louis; and by a gift of 200,000 livres he was induced to postpone the meeting of Parliament until the following April. Then having pocketed the bribe of Louis, he agreed to the proposal of Danby that William of Orange should be invited to visit England.

The ostensible purpose of the visit was to secure the mediation of Charles for terms of peace with France, but there was, also, in contemplation a marriage between the prince and Mary, daughter of the Duke of York, the main commendation of which to Charles was that it would place him on the best of terms with the Commons and the country. But how to excuse himself to Louis? Louis felt the blow “as he would have felt the loss of an army”; and Charles could only explain that the rashness of his brother in resolving to make profession of his Catholicism made it inevitable; though he suggested that it would remove the suspicion that his alliance with France had any connection with a proposed change of religion, and thus the jealousy of France would be dissipated, while the prince would also be readier to coincide with his wishes. This, however, was but cold comfort for Louis. On the signature of peace, 18th

June 1678, between England and Holland, Charles also withdrew his troops from the French service; and at the opening of Parliament in February he applied for supplies for ninety ships and 40,000 men, ostensibly with the view of compelling France to come to terms with Holland. This was agreed to, and it was decided to raise £100,000 to enable his Majesty to enter into actual war with France. His Majesty had, however, no such terrible intentions. The mark he shot at was a lucrative bargain with Louis; and, in return for a stipend of £240,000 for three years, he agreed either to remain neutral or to obtain for Louis favourable terms of peace. But his difficulty was the Commons. Unless he declared war on France, they insisted on immediate disbandment. He decided to disband, and money was voted for supply on this condition; but after proroguing Parliament on 15th July, he resolved, on account of the threatening attitude of Louis towards the Dutch, not immediately to disband; and on 26th July the Anglo-Dutch treaty was signed, which caused Louis, on 10th August, to agree to the Peace of Nimeguen.

With the Peace of Nimeguen closes the third phase of the sovereignty of Charles II. The distinguishing characteristic of it and the previous one was the dexterity with which he succeeded in utilising both Louis and the Commons for the supply of his enormous pecuniary necessities. The deftness of his manœuvring is beyond dispute; but its morality was that of the common sharper; and its statesmanship was almost extirpated by the sordid enactments of expediency. In the next, the fourth and last phase of his sovereignty, the situation becomes more puzzling and critical, and to deal with it successfully calls for the exercise of a greater diversity of gifts. Danger seems ever lurking to pounce on him should he permit himself to come within its reach; and almost unique demands are made

on his self-command, courage, tact, and foresight. That in a sense he proved more than equal to the situation, that he was able to deal with it, so as even to turn it to his special advantage, that he passed its ordeal not merely safely but triumphantly, with augmented rather than diminished popularity, and with a more firmly established authority, implies that his faults and weaknesses were so far counterbalanced by uncommon endowments. Whatever there may be to condemn in this last phase of his sovereignty, his abilities and even his character are seen to much better advantage than at any previous period of his life.

The new turn to events was brought about by the dramatic interposition of one whose life had hitherto been obscure and occasionally even squalid. The open Catholicism of the Duke of York had already become a disquieting portent, and now led to the appearance on the political arena of the sinister figure of Titus Oates, whose amazing annunciations created a series of lamentable outbreaks of Protestant frenzy. There was just sufficient truth in his malignant fictions to give them a colour of credibility. He was not speaking quite without book; during his association with the Jesuits, he would appear to have heard hints that some great Catholic enterprise was on the stocks. Though his effrontery was phenomenal, he was emboldened by the belief that there was a trail which might be hit upon by the accusation of likely persons; and at the very beginning he was remarkably favoured of fortune. By accusing Coleman, who had been secretary to the Duchess of York, and had been engaged by the Duke in various Catholic intrigues, he did hit on what appeared a very warm trail. Certain of Coleman's letters dealt with "a mighty work upon our hands, no less than the conversion of three kingdoms," through the instrumentality

of the Duke of York aided by the French king. Such statements could not fail to produce on the excitable multitude a strong sensation, and when, a fortnight afterwards, the body of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey—a magistrate with whom Oates had left a copy of his declaration—was found dead in a ditch on Primrose Hill, the Anti-Papal agitation became a raging tempest of mingled passion and terror.

Oates now became the Protestant hero of the hour, against whose mendacity it was hardly safe to utter a protesting murmur. Shaftesbury and the Whigs might be excused if, at first, they were disposed to put some credence in his statements; but when they must have known his real character, they continued to utilise him with the utmost recklessness in order to foment the agitation against the succession of the Duke of York. Charles, again, might well have been uneasy as to what Oates might actually know; but having by one or two searching questions disclosed his quackery and villainy, he treated his campaign of mendacity with, apparently, cynical indifference. Here his conduct has been pronounced beyond palliation; but however black the disgrace he may thus have incurred, it quite pales before the monstrous and awful turpitude of those who—in however good, as they thought, a cause—were hounding on Oates and Bedloe in their murderous career. Partly Charles was acting on the principle of giving them line, but, evidently he also recognised that no good purpose to others, and a very bad purpose to himself, might be served by interfering with the agitation. He had made up his mind, he told Sidney, “to wait till this violence shall wear off.” We can hardly quarrel with his lack of Quixotism: it is a luxury usually denied to a monarch; and a blind attempt to indulge in it was to be the ruin of his brother.

Moreover, without somewhat careful impartiality on his part, the agitation might be diverted in his direction. The Coleman letters might suggest the possibility of compromising relations between him and Louis; and a glimpse, if nothing more, of this was revealed by Louis himself. Resolved to ruin Danby, he let it be known that he had been negotiating on behalf of Charles for a sum of £300,000, on condition of securing for Louis favourable terms of peace. The tool he made use of was Montague, the English ambassador at Paris, who had a special grudge at Danby. With the aid of Barillon, Montague revealed Danby's letters. But, indirectly, they reflected on Charles; he was living almost on the crater of a volcano; for the character of his relations with Louis would not bear revelation, more especially those suggestive of the possibility of a Catholic revolution. To save Danby, Charles, at his request, agreed in January 1679 to dissolve the Parliament, but in the new House the Shaftesbury party had it all their own way. Thereupon Charles assumed sole responsibility for the letters, and declared that though he had relieved Danby of his office, he had given him a free pardon, and, if necessary, would give him it ten times over; he even elevated him to a marquisate. Nevertheless, the House resolved on his impeachment; and when Charles, to prevent his arrest, received him in Whitehall, the Commons passed a Bill of Attainder, to be effective unless he surrendered himself within a certain time. He did surrender himself, but, although committed to the Tower, where he remained five years, he continued in close communication with the king.

During the more and more electric atmosphere of the next two years, Charles alone remained serenely undisturbed. The Anti-Catholic *furore*, so long as it passed him by, was a kind of God-send to him.

It told more and more in his favour. The difficulties as to his succession emphasised his present indispensability. How much his position had been improved by the joint folly of the Duke of York's enemies and the Duke himself was shown when the sudden illness of Charles in August 1679 caused a kind of national panic; and even the absurd charge against the queen of plotting to poison him on behalf of Catholicism might be reckoned a high compliment to himself.

Those who opposed the succession of the Duke of York on account of his Catholicism, desired that Charles should either divorce Catherine and marry a Protestant with a view of having a Protestant heir, or that he should agree to the succession of the Duke of Monmouth. The Anti-Catholic sentiment tended at first to become concentrated on Catherine; and to effect her ruin Bedloe first accused her servants of the murder of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, and then, going a step further, Oates ascribed to her a purpose to poison her husband. That the Commons actually made these absurd slanders a reason for proposing her removal from Whitehall, and that the Council actually suggested that she had better stand her trial, is striking evidence of the wildly inflamed character of public feeling. But even when the excitement was at its height, Charles maintained his tranquillity; and while he manifested no alarm, he took no steps to punish the slanderers, as his father no doubt would have sought to do. He was content to treat the accusations with contempt, but he behaved towards his wife with a kind consideration he had not shown before, and took care to let it be understood that they were on the best of terms with each other. "She was," he told Burnet, "a weak woman, and had some disagreeable humours, but was not capable of a wicked thing, and considering his own faultiness to her in

some things, he thought it a horrid thing to abandon her." As a consequence of his unruffled support of her, the calumnies were gradually discredited; and when Shaftesbury, on 18th November 1680, moved for a bill of divorce between her and the king, he found such a change in the attitude towards her that after adjournments he deemed it advisable to let the matter drop.

As for the other alternative, that of recognising the Duke of Monmouth as his heir, there might be some temptation on the score of paternity. But he declined to support the fiction that he had been married to Monmouth's mother, Lucy Walter, a lady whose subsequent career could hardly be deemed corroborative of such a supposition; and he resolved not to interfere with the succession either of his brother or his brother's children. He told Burnet that he would rather see Monmouth hanged than legitimate him, and he strenuously denied that he had ever been married to any one but Queen Catherine. If Charles was secretly a Catholic, his declinature of a divorce from Catherine or of the recognition of Monmouth as his successor was natural enough; but even if he was a Catholic of a sort, his own interests came with him before those of Catholicism; and had he been a less self-possessed politician than he was, he might have been tempted by the popularity and security to himself that would be gained by yielding to the Catholic agitation against his brother. That he avoided this temptation may be partly ascribed to recognition that to do so would be playing into the hands of those who desired to curb his own authority, and to his conviction that the extravagances of the agitators were bound to cause a reaction against them, and greatly to strengthen his own position.

If, however, it be asked whether he was convinced

that his Catholic brother, apart from being the legitimate heir, was in the stereotyped phrase "a fit and proper person" to succeed him, the answer, it is to be feared, must be in the negative. His brother's resolve no longer to conform to the Church of England, he regarded—in the present temper of the nation—as inexcusable folly, and his obtuseness, his narrowness, his impracticability, awakened deep misgivings as to his possible fate. "I am much afraid," he said, "that when he comes to the crown he will be obliged to travel again." But then—(1) it was as likely as not that he would survive his brother; (2) his responsibility for the sovereignty ended with his own reign, and it was beyond his duty to decide as to the fitness of his successor; (3) the fitness of Monmouth for the sovereignty was far from evident; and (4) the arrangement for Monmouth's succession was bound to lead to political confusion. He may also have been perfectly sincere—he may have been convinced that he was doing the best he could both for his brother and the nation—in suggesting that instead of the Exclusion Bill, a provision should be passed for guaranteeing the security of the Protestant religion.

Apart, however, from these considerations, Charles, from motives of expediency, sought to assume towards the dispute the attitude of impartiality and compromise; he did all that he could to avoid being reckoned a partisan; and thus he treated Monmouth's pretensions with a forbearance that might be mistaken for weakness. "There is one thing," wrote the Duke of York to Colonel Legg, "troubles me very much, and puts odd things in my head: it is all this while his Majesty has never said a word, nor gone about to make a good understanding between me and the Duke of Monmouth." At the suggestion of Temple the experiment was tried of a large Privy Council, repre-

senting various parties in the State, with a view to improve the king's relations with the Parliament. This the king welcomed as a kind of *divertissement*, even nominating Shaftesbury as its president; but he remarked to Ailesbury: "Odds fish! they have put a set of men about me but they shall know nothing."

On 29th May 1679, Charles, as we have seen, prorogued the Parliament, and in July dissolved it; and the new Parliament was prorogued till January 1680. Shaftesbury's party now took upon them to present a petition setting forth the necessity, in the perilous condition of affairs, of consulting with the great council of the nation; but while agreeing to consider the matter, Charles caustically expressed the hearty wish that all others were as solicitous for the peace of the nation as himself. His practical answer also was the prorogation of Parliament until November, and the issue of a proclamation denouncing such petitions as illegal. But when petitions poured in from various parts of the country, he, knowing how they were engineered, simply informed the petitioners that they were interfering with what was no business of theirs. As addresses also followed expressing abhorrence of the petitions, he could afford to permit the two parties to expend their political excitement on each other.

Shaftesbury now proposed to drop the Exclusion Bill on condition that the king assented to a divorce and married a Protestant; but Charles merely replied that since the Duke's absence—on the advice of Charles he had gone to Scotland—had not produced the tranquillity he expected, he proposed to recall him. It was further arranged to welcome the Duke by a banquet at the Lord Mayor's, and the illumination of the city. This caused Shaftesbury to spread the story of Monmouth's legitimacy, but the

king was probably more diverted than disturbed by the fiction of the strong box, and other tales of the pamphleteers.

The next device of Shaftesbury was, with other Whig leaders, to appear on 26th June at Westminster Hall, to present the Duke of York as a Popish recusant, and to indict the Duchess of Portsmouth as a political nuisance; but the Chief Justice discharged the jury before they could find a bill. Still, Charles deemed it well that before the meeting of Parliament summoned for October the Duke should be out of the way, and proposed that he and the Duchess should return to Scotland. Seven of the council were in favour of the proposal and eleven against it, upon which he archly remarked, "Since he has so many friends for him I see he must go."

In his speech to the Parliament, Charles, while resolute against Exclusion, proposed a provision for guaranteeing the security of the Protestant religion, but this only added fuel to the wrath of the Duke of York's opponents. The Exclusion Bill on 11th November passed the Commons, and when influenced mainly by the masterly speeches of Halifax, the Lords threw it out, the Commons presented to the king an address against Halifax. To their representations he suavely replied, "He did not find the grounds in the address of this House to be sufficient to induce him to remove the Earl of Halifax." Sir John Reresby, who on 24th December was present with others at the king's going to bed, relates that he was in such bright humour that he entertained them with his talk until about half-past one in the morning, and that he seemed quite free from trouble, although "every one guessed he must either dismiss the Parliament in a few days, or give himself up to what they desired." The general opinion, also, was that

he would have to accept the latter alternative. That Nell Gwynne, "the Protestant whore," should pose as a supporter of Monmouth, was quite in keeping with her irresponsible audacity; but when the Duchess of Portsmouth seemed to have succumbed to the bribes of the Shaftesbury party and joined the Exclusionists, who could be certain that the king himself was not contemplating surrender? That the Duchess should prefer bribes to prosecution was only natural; and she may well have been tempted to do her utmost to make the Duke of York her scapegoat; but whether or not she exerted her influence against the Duke, she did not succeed in persuading the king, who may, however, have keenly relished such a method of spoiling and beguiling the Egyptians. On 18th January 1681 he suddenly prorogued the Parliament, summoning another to meet in March, not in London but Oxford.

Even Halifax did not dream that the change of the meeting-place to Oxford had any special significance; he was merely puzzled and perplexed by the king's apparent indecision. It troubled him so much that he lamented to Reresby that "it would ruin all, if his Majesty continued to advise with those of one interest one day, and hearken to those of another to-morrow"; and he declared that "his Ministers could not be safe under such uncertainties." But the uncertainties of Charles were meant merely to veil his final intentions. As before, he offered the Commons a compromise, and expressed his willingness to listen to a proposal by which "in the case of a Popish successor, the administration of the government might remain in Protestant hands." If, however, the Exclusionists interpreted his suggestion as a symptom of weakness on the main issue, they had previously had fair warning against laying any such flattering unction to their

souls. When Shaftesbury privately sought to win his assent to the succession of Monmouth, "My Lord," he replied, "let there be no delusion. I will never yield, and I will not let myself be intimidated."

That his intervention might be fully effective it was incumbent that it should be sudden; and he made skilful preparations to heighten the dramatic effect. March 28th had been fixed for the great event of the session, the introduction of the Exclusion Bill; and since the Commons had been complaining of the limited accommodation in the Convocation House, he ordered that the Sheldonian Theatre should be prepared for them; but hardly had they assembled when Black Rod knocked at the door to summon them to wait on the king in the House of Lords. What might the summons portend? Surely, thought the majority of the excited throng as they crowded into his presence, he is about at last, in some way, to yield to the inevitable. Dissolution was not in all their thoughts, but dissolution was the doom which, by his direction, the Lord Chancellor now pronounced. So confounded were they with the sudden change in the situation, that they succumbed with a silent helplessness all the more striking from its contrast with their antecedent assertiveness. No attempt was made to disobey the royal commands, no protesting murmurs were raised against them. From one whose intentions were so incalculable, the Exclusionist members might well be apprehensive of a more unpleasant surprise should they show a disposition to make any resistance. They, therefore, did not even delay to consult with one another about the situation, but as quickly as vehicles could be procured left the city for their several homes. The serious crisis had become transformed into mere high comedy. For Charles, it was, as he might have said, "as good as a play."

He thoroughly enjoyed the humours of the situation and the perturbation he had produced. He had hardly other option than to do what he did; but he did it with gleeful confidence: as he returned to his dressing-room with triumphant amusement gleaming in his eyes, he remarked with witty terseness, "Better one king than five hundred."

No one then knew—no one but Hyde the Treasurer, Barillon, and Louis XIV.—how he was enabled, from a pecuniary point of view, to defy the Commons with so light a heart. On condition of detaching himself from the Spanish alliance and preventing the interference of the Parliament with the policy of France, he had arranged to receive from Louis, within the next three years, a sum amounting to twelve and a half million francs. He had thus, in his old fashion, made himself secure against pecuniary discomfort. But as a political strategist his merit was, in a difficult crisis, to have seized the psychological moment for adopting the one bold course fitted to save the situation. Had he succumbed to the pressure of the Commons and passed the Exclusion Bill it is hard to tell what might have been the consequences to Britain, for, be it remembered, the wife of the Prince of Orange was next legitimate heir, and the Prince would certainly at first have sided with his father-in-law against the Duke of Monmouth, while even if the foolish Monmouth had succeeded, is it likely that the fortunes of Britain would have been happier under him than under the bigotedly Catholic James II. and VII.? But whatever might have been the consequences of an Exclusion Act, that Charles had judged the situation correctly, so far as his own sovereign interests were concerned, was shown by the manner in which his decision was received by the nation. The tide had begun to turn, and was

now with him. The nation had been more than satiated with the excesses of the anti-Catholic frenzy. It was beginning to be sick and ashamed of them; and the Exclusionists as the special patrons of Oates and Bedloe were bound to suffer from the reaction against them. The peremptoriness of the king thus harmonised with the prevailing sentiments of the nation. It created tranquillity rather than discontent, and awakened more gratitude than resentment. Even as regards the Duke of York, a "strange change," Burnet remarks, "appeared over the nation, from such an eager pursuit of the Exclusion to an indecent courting and magnifying him."

The reaction was greatly aided by the king's Declaration of April 8th, in which, with much point, he contrasted the wild and blind partisanship of the Commons with his own persistent efforts to promote reconciliation and peace; and after the flight of Shaftesbury to Holland to escape a prosecution, which after the election of Tory sheriffs for the City of London he knew would be successful, the political difficulties of Charles were at an end. Measures were now taken to obtain the surrender of the city and borough charters, with a view to greater control over juries and to secure the election, when the time came, of a House of Commons more pliable than the old one. But, as a consequence of the new Tory predominance, the position of Nonconformists became more uncomfortable than ever.

The desperate plight of the Exclusionists caused the contrivance, in October 1682, of a plot to murder or kidnap the king and the Duke of York at the Rye House, a lonely dwelling near Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire. Whether it failed from the king's return from Newmarket sooner than was expected, or, as "Fergusson the Plotter" asserted, it was departed from by the substitution, at his instance and at the eleventh hour, of a

scheme for a general insurrection, whether the respectable nobles, convicted of their connection with it, were concerned merely in the insurrectionary scheme, cannot here be discussed. It must suffice to note that its discovery in the spring of 1683 completed the discomfiture of the Exclusionists and greatly strengthened the king's position. The nation was not, meanwhile, disposed to embark in any desperate adventures. Whatever the imperfections of Charles II. either as a man or sovereign, there was a general impression that the nation might fare worse rather than better by his removal. His seeming indifference as to how the world wagged, provided he was allowed to prosecute in peace his various sports and diversions, tended to dissipate distrust of his political aims; and the absence of political fret and agitation did much to promote a general sense of political content.

Having accomplished his purpose, Charles allowed his subordinates a very free hand in the administration of details. The Duchess of Portsmouth appeared to share his chief political confidence, and was, apparently, entrusted with the decision of matters of considerable moment, though she may have often acted rather at his instance than according to her own discretion. During his later years her hold on his affections increased rather than diminished; and the threatened rivalry of Philip of Vendôme probably occasioned him more perplexity than any great political crisis had ever done. With Philip's departure for France, Charles remained lulled in domestic, as well as meanwhile in political, peace. According to the Triennial Act a new Parliament had formally to be summoned in 1684, but he deemed it advisable to postpone doing so. In violation of the Test Act he also, in May of that year, conferred on the Duke of York the office of Lord High Admiral. What further proposals he may have been meditating, how

he would have proceeded to confirm and strengthen his supremacy, how long he would have postponed the summoning of another Parliament, whether his popularity would have gradually waned, what the character of events might have been in the immediately succeeding years had he, and not his brother, been at the helm of affairs, there are hardly sufficient data for any very precise conjecture. He had given no very definite indication of the policy he intended to pursue, and he appeared to enjoy the general confidence of the nation, when, on the morning of 2nd February 1685, he was suddenly seized with an apoplectic fit, which proved fatal on the 6th. Throughout his short and trying illness he bore himself with his usual easy and unconcerned self-command, apologising with humorous courtesy to those about him for the trouble he was giving in being so long in dying. His solicitude for the future welfare of the Duchess of Portsmouth, and his entreaty to his brother not "to let poor Nellie starve," seem to show that his good nature and his amorous generosity were not altogether a mere form of selfish weakness, that he was capable of durable, however misplaced, affection. Indeed, the considerateness with which he also treated his mother's by no means pleasant humours, while not succumbing to her inveterate attempts to dictate to him, indicates much filial kindness; and his tender affection for his favourite sister Henrietta is attested in various charmingly intimate letters.

The question as to whether Charles became a sincere and convinced Catholic was at one time reckoned of more consequence than it is now. If he died as a Catholic, he did not find it advisable to live, even formally, as a professor of that faith, and his ecclesiastical convictions—if he possessed any assured convictions—had little or no bearing on his private conduct,

a case, however, by no means uncommon. With his experiences of the political inconveniences and disquietudes caused by the Protestant squabbles of his time, it is not surprising that he came to prefer Catholicism to Protestantism as the national form of faith. He may also have concluded that of the two forms of Christianity, Catholicism was less likely to be heretical than Protestantism; but if he felt the need of either it was apparently mainly as a kind of thaumaturgy, which might possibly make things agreeable for him in the next world, should there happen to be something of the kind. He was not, however, averse to take advantage of even any future benefit that might accrue to him from the dispensations of Protestantism. While ignoring the attempts of the Protestant Bishop Ken to induce him to take the Eucharist, he made no objection to his pronouncing over him the absolution. For the manner in which he received the suggestion that he should obtain Catholic absolution we have to depend on the testimony of his brother, published some time afterwards, with the view of promoting the interests of Catholicism. That his brother, his wife, and the Duchess of Portsmouth were all anxious that he should consent to the Catholic ceremony may have weighed a good deal with him; but the reasons that induced him to do so cannot now be definitely determined. Two essays in support of the Catholic faith, one found in a strong box and the other in a closet, were printed by James II., with the certification that they were in his brother's handwriting; and they were republished in Father Huddleston's *Short and Plain Way to the Faith of the Church*, 1688. But they manifest nothing that is characteristic of Charles; and he was not given to theological ratiocination. David Lloyd, in his *Memoirs*, makes mention of "several majestick poems," written by Charles in his youth; but

his statement quite lacks corroboration; nor is his authorship of the later lines beginning—

“I pass all my hours in a shady old grove,”

sufficiently attested.

The one striking feature in the reign of Charles was his triumph over his very varied difficulties, the fact that notwithstanding the undiminished bitterness of the old ecclesiastical feuds and his own far from decorous conduct either as man or sovereign, he should for a quarter of a century have maintained his power and popularity, and in the end have attained to an almost unique kind of sovereign ascendancy. This extorts a certain admiring wonder, but hardly of a higher kind than one bestows on the feats of an exceedingly clever juggler. Yet if his reign was one of the most despicable in the whole annals of English history, the blame cannot be wholly assigned to him. His culpability is in many ways evident enough, but it is hardly so uniform and complete as that of the Commons, for, unlike the Commons, he was not the mere representative of prejudiced ecclesiastical partisanship. There were in him the possible makings of a statesman; gleams of statesmanship manifested themselves amongst the personal and royal selfishness and the merely pecuniary considerations by which his conduct was so largely dictated; but in the Commons there are hardly any faint traces of statesmanship; the prevailing motive by which they were swayed was ecclesiastical bigotry, and this for the simple reason that it was still rampant in the nation. There is, in fact, no more special virtue in a mere House of Commons than there is in sovereignty. The character of a House of Commons depends mainly on the character of those whom it represents. On the other hand, a nation moderately wise and inclined to peaceful diligence has often been

cursed by the rule of a bad or foolish king ; but, again, the rule of a wise and able king has often exercised much wholesome restraint over a stupid, ignorant, brutal, and more or less unruly nation ; and of Charles II. it might at least be said that, with all his faults, he showed himself a more competent ruler of the nation than the House of Commons of his day, and that he, rather than it, preserved the nation from anarchy and a second civil war.

Burnet declares that the body of Charles II. "did not lie in state ; no mournings were given ; and the expense of it was not equal to what an ordinary nobleman's funeral might be." In Clarke's *Life of James II.* it is, however, affirmed that the body did lie in state, and that the illuminations and mournings were very solemn ; but it is explained that "the obsequies could not be performed with so great solemnity as some persons expected," on account of the religious difficulty. He was buried, like his grandfather, and great-grandmother, in Henry VII.'s Chapel in Westminster Abbey.

With regard to James de la Cloche, the eldest reputed son of Charles II., no adequate reason is discoverable why Charles should seek to conceal his existence from all but a few and the name of his mother from every one, while the mother assigned him, Donna Maria Stewart, of the family of the Barons of San Marzo (presumably Earls of March), cannot be identified by a reference to any peerage. The statements as to the date of his birth are also contradictory ; and his pretensions have been fully disposed of by the late Mr Lang in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

Besides the Duke of Monmouth, Charles had by Lucy Walter a daughter ; by Elizabeth Killigrew, daughter of Sir William Killigrew, created Countess of Shannon, he had a daughter, Charlotte Jemima Henrietta Maria,

married first to James Howard and afterwards to Sir William Preston, Earl of Yarmouth; and by Catherine Peg he had a son, Charles Fitzcharles, created Earl of Plymouth. Six children by the Duchess of Cleveland are reputedly his: Charles Fitzroy, Duke of Southampton, and afterwards Duke of Cleveland; Henry, Duke of Grafton; George, Duke of Norfolk; Anne, married to Thomas Lemond, Earl of Sussex; Charlotte, married to Sir Edward Henry Lee, Earl of Lichfield; and Barbara, who took the veil at Pontoise in France. By the Duchess of Portsmouth he had a son, Charles Lennox, created Duke of Richmond; by Nell Gwynne he had two sons, Charles Beauclerk, created Duke of St Albans, and James Beauclerk, who in his tenth year died in France; and by Moll Davies he had a daughter, Mary Tudor, married to Francis Ratcliff, Earl of Derwentwater.

CHAPTER XIV.

JAMES II. AND VII.—AS DUKE OF YORK.

JAMES II., a younger brother of Charles II., was born at St James's, 14th October 1633. Shortly after his christening, by Archbishop Laud, on 24th November, he was created Duke of York and Albany. During his infancy he was committed to the charge of Lady Dorset, and later his principal tutor was Dr Duppa, who was also tutor of his elder brother.

After the breach with the Parliament in 1642, Charles I. ordered the boy to be sent to him at York. As a ruse to get possession of Hull, he was deputed with the Prince Palatine and several nobles to pay a visit of courtesy to the town, but though they were respectfully received by the mayor and the governor, entrance was next day refused to the king unless he came accompanied with only twelve men. With the Prince of Wales he joined his father in the opening campaign; and although left in Oxford during the reconnaissance round London, he accompanied him to the siege of Gloucester. On his return to Oxford he continued there during the remainder of the war, pursuing his studies under various tutors.

When Charles I. left Oxford to place himself in the hands of the Scots, he made no arrangement for the boy's removal or escape. According to the articles for

the city's surrender, 24th June 1646, he was to be delivered into the hands of the Parliament to be disposed of according to their pleasure. When next day the Parliamentary army entered the city, Sir Robert Fairfax and other officers introduced themselves to him, Sir Robert making him a short awkward speech, but not kissing his hand; and while the other officers kissed his hand, Cromwell alone knelt in doing so. About the beginning of July, Parliament ordered him to be brought to London, within a few miles of which he was met by Northumberland, who discharged Sir George Ratcliffe, his governor, and all his other attendants. He was then brought to St James's, where, with the other royal children, he remained under the charge of Northumberland. A sum of £600 was voted for providing him with a coach and apparel, and £15,000 as yearly allowance. The children were permitted to visit their father both at Caversham and Hampton Court.

It was the desire of Charles I. after his freedom of intercourse with his children was restricted, that the Duke of York should seek to make his escape from England; and in the end it was at the king's instance effected by Colonel Bampfield, with the co-operation of Anne Murray (afterwards Lady Halkett), daughter of Thomas Murray, who had been tutor to Charles I. Bampfield having got into communication with him, advised that he should practise with his brother and sister and other children the game of hide-and-seek, so that his escape should cause no immediate alarm. On 20th April 1648 the children engaged, as usual, in their after-supper pastime; but the search for the duke met that night with no success. He went down the back-stairs to the inmost garden, and having previously obtained the key of a door leading into the park, he, on opening it, found Bampfield and a servant waiting

him. Having put on him a cloak and periwig they hastened with him to a coach, with which they drove to Salisbury House. Passing directly through the house and proceeding down Ivy Lane to the river, they took a small boat to the Old Swan Stairs, close to the old London Bridge. Thence they went to the house of a surgeon named Loe, where Anne Murray was in waiting with a female dress, which had been made for him according to measure. Towards midnight the duke, as the sister of Bampffield, who went by the name of Andrews, proceeded across the bridge to the stairs, where a four-oared barge lay in waiting. After Miss Murray had presented him with a Wood Street cake, "which," she says, "I knew he loved," the barge conveyed them to the *Dutch Pride*, anchored at Tilbury, and by the second morning they had reached Middelburg. On arriving at the Hague he was welcomed by his sister, the Princess of Orange, "with the greatest joy imaginable."

In the absence in England of the duke's proper guardian, Lord Byron, the queen sent Sir John Berkeley to take his place, Bampffield being made a groom in the duke's bedchamber. Disappointed by so small a reward for his services, Bampffield arranged with the revolted portion of the fleet, then arrived in Holland, to set sail in it with the duke on a special expedition; but the project was frustrated by the arrival of the Prince of Wales, who directed the duke and his attendants to remain at the Hague. At the request of the king, Bampffield then returned to England, where he was engaged in various intrigues.

After eight months at the Hague, the duke, on 13th February 1649, joined his mother in Paris; but her joy in welcoming him was suddenly saddened by the news of the king's execution. On Mademoiselle de Montpensier the duke produced a more favourable

impression than did his brother. At Oxford as well as at St James's his education and deportment had been carefully supervised; for there is no truth whatever in the statement of Burnet that he "was much neglected in his childhood, during the time he was under his father's care." Mademoiselle describes him as "a charming young prince between thirteen and fourteen years of age, with a good face, fine figure, and fair complexion." His fluent French gave him also, she states, an "immense advantage" over his brother, and she was "greatly pleased" with his conversation.

In September 1650 the duke accompanied his brother to Jersey, and after Charles, in February, returned to Holland, he remained there until the following September. Before he left, Charles had gone to Scotland; and his inactive and penurious plight in Paris made the duke restive. The domineering solicitude of his mother also became irksome; and he resented her arts "to draw him over to her religion." Thus he readily fell in with the proposal of Sir Edward Herbert, Sir George Ratcliffe and his chaplain, Dr Killigrew, that he should go to Brussels with a view to induce the Duke of Lorraine "to enable him to appear in actions that might be for his master's service." All that he received, however, was a gift of 1000 pistoles; and when Sir George Ratcliffe took upon him to propose the boy's marriage to the Duke of Lorraine's bastard daughter, he was told that the proposal could not be entertained without the consent of Charles. The duke now thought to visit his sister at the Hague, but on account of a letter from the queen she declined to receive him, whereupon he went to Rheussen, a house of the Queen of Bohemia. In the end his mother granted permission to his sister to invite him to the Hague; but since the Prince of Orange had lately died, she could do little to supply his wants; and, on account

of the relations of the States with Cromwell, he had also to withdraw to Breda, where Hyde (afterwards Earl of Clarendon), sent by Henrietta to urge him to return to Paris, "found him in present want of everything." A letter from Charles also commanded him to return, and to "dismiss his chaplain from his service, and no more to follow the advice of Sir George Ratcliffe." On his arrival in Paris, about the end of June 1651, his mother received him, says Clarendon, "without those expostulations and reprehensions which might reasonably have been expected; though her severity was the same towards all those who, she thought, had the credit and power to seduce him."

Shortly after the safe arrival of Charles from England, negotiations were begun for the duke's marriage to the only daughter of the Duc de Longueville, who, next to Mademoiselle de Montpensier, was reckoned "the greatest match in France." Clarendon describes her as "in respect of her person not at all attractive, being a lady of very low stature, and that stature in no degree straight"; but the duke, while almost as amorous as his brother, was, unlike him, but little influenced by personal attractions; and he himself tell us he was "very easily induced" to the match; but the French court declined to sanction it.

Shortly afterwards Cardinal Mazarin suggested that he should be sent "to learn his *métier*" under Marshal Turenne, then engaged against the Frondeurs under the Prince of Condé; and the duke pressed his wish to go with such "earnestness and passion," that though Charles and his mother were loathe to give his wish their approbation, Charles ultimately, at Hyde's suggestion, determined not to oppose it. The duke's difficulty was now "lack of money to furnish out an equipage"; but having borrowed from "a Gascon who

had been in England" three hundred pistoles, and been presented by his brother with a set of Polish coach horses, he, along with Sir John Berkeley, Colonel Worden, and a few servants and grooms, set out on April 21st from St Germain on the pretence of hunting, and on the 24th met Turenne's army at Chartres on the night of its arrival there.

The first campaign comprised the siege of Étampes and the series of desperate encounters with Condé in the Faubourg St Antoine, outside the walls of Paris, which were terminated by the reception of the worsted Condé within the walls at the instance of Mademoiselle de Montpensier, who herself mounted the Bastille and ordered cannon fire to be opened on Turenne's troops. The Duke of Lorraine now approached Paris, and Condé having joined him, the two armies thrust Turenne "into a narrow nook, as it might be called, between the Yerre and the Seine"; but Turenne during the night crossed the river by a bridge of boats with his whole army and, accompanied by the king and court, entered Paris amidst "great acclamations of joy." In the October campaign the duke narrowly escaped capture at the siege of Vervins by a squadron of Spanish horse. At the siege of Mousson in 1653 he had various hairbreadth escapes. In the following summer he joined Turenne as one of his eight lieutenant-generals, and had various stirring and dangerous adventures in connection with the relief of Arras. The campaign ended with the capture and fortification of Quesnow to facilitate the designs of the following year, which, however, was devoted mainly to inconclusive manœuvring and sieges. At the end of the campaign Turenne was summoned to the court, and the duke was left in command of the French army, "at," as he himself narrates, "the very time when peace between

France and Cromwell was concluded and actually published, and by which treaty I was by name banished from France."

But, strange to say, the duke was prepared to stomach the insult. To retain the Irish troops in the French army, Mazarin arranged with Cromwell that the duke might be permitted to serve in any of the armies except that of Flanders; and when the duke was offered the captain-generalship of the French troops under the Duke of Modena in Piedmont, he was eager to accept the offer, representing to his brother that the continuance of his salary and other perquisites "would enable him to live at ease and with decency till his Majesty should have his services in England." The answer to this was the king's absolute command that he should return to Flanders "with all haste imaginable." Apart from other considerations, Charles had special use for him in commanding the English and Irish regiments which he hoped to transfer from the service of France to that of Spain. On account also of the strong French partisanship of Sir John Berkeley he desired that the duke should dismiss him from his service. There is evidence of an attempt of Cromwell to utilise Sir John in sowing discord between the two brothers; and the duke so bitterly resented the command of his brother that after sending Sir John away he joined him in Holland. Thereupon Charles informed him that if he would return, "all his servants would be treated with all kindness."

The reconciliation having been cemented by Berkeley's elevation to the peerage as Baron Berkeley, the duke with six regiments of foot, numbering over 2000, set out for the Spanish army bound for the relief of Calais; but within a day's march from the town information was received of the miscarriage of the enterprise. This was now to be a common experience of

the duke; after his apprenticeship under Turenne, the remissness and hampering formalities of the Spanish generals greatly amazed him, all the more that they were men of "much bravery and good sense." In the spring these defects were signally illustrated at Dunkirk. Here it was the duke's fate to charge the English regiments with his Horse Guards; but the final result of the encounter was in doubt when the French advance became so irresistible that the whole Spanish army was soon in headlong flight. After Dunkirk's surrender, in June 1658, the duke, with the Marquis de Caracenas, was left in command of Nieuport; but on news reaching him of the death of Cromwell, he was relieved by Don John and returned to Brussels.

In connection with the Royalist rising in August 1659, the duke proceeded to Boulogne, and at Amiens had an interview with Turenne, who offered to supply him with 5000 men and the means of their transport to England; but the news of Booth's defeat put an end to the project. In the spring of 1660 the duke received from Spain the offer of the office of High Admiral with the command against Portugal, but events were progressing so rapidly towards the Restoration that he never left to take up his command. As Lord High Admiral he was in command of the fleet which brought Charles to Dover. He and the Duke of Gloucester disembarked with him, and accompanied him to London. "At this time," writes Sir John Reresby, "the court at Whitehall (and the Dukes of York and Gloucester having theirs distinct from the king's) was very splendid." All the three brothers were, for the time being, immoderately popular. Though the Duke of York lacked the king's magnetism, he was frank and courteous, and he was encircled with the glamour of military renown. Rather above the middle height, he was well shaped, and his military training was

visible in his manner and bearing. While his features resembled those of his brother, they were more refined and less marked, and he had a fair complexion. He was diligent, well meaning, and fairly efficient in business matters and military routine, but, unlike the king, he was quite an ordinary, commonplace kind of person. He had, says Burnet, "no vivacity of thought, invention, or expression." "I wonder," remarked his outspoken mistress, the Countess of Dorchester, "for what qualities James chooses his mistresses. We are none of us handsome, and if we have wit, he has not enough himself to find it out." If, however, his talk was not very exhilarating, it was, within limits, shrewd and sensible; and he was very conversible; Burnet states that he was "very easy to all who came near him"; and in his avowed friendships he was more dependable than his brother. His military training had also made him more methodical in his habits; work was a necessity for him no less than amusement. Hunting, pell-mell, and golf were his chief recreations; like all the gallants of the time, he patronised cock-fighting; and occasionally he accompanied his brother to Newmarket. He had no strong scientific bent, and his artistic tastes were limited, though Grammont mentions that he played on the guitar.

During a visit to his sister, the Princess of Orange, the duke, in 1656, fell in love with Hyde's daughter, Anne, then one of her maids of honour; and after he quitted the Spanish service, they again met at Breda, where he allowed himself to be so overmastered by his passion as, on 24th November 1659, to contract a secret marriage with her. At the Restoration she quitted the service of the Princess of Orange, and resided as an unmarried maiden in her father's house. The duke had now, probably, repented of his amour; but as the lady was with child he had to make known his predicament

to his brother, who was terribly angry at the dilemma in which it placed him. The duke himself seems to have come to the opinion that the lady had been too clever for him. She "showed," he tells us, "both her wit and her virtue in so managing the affair" as to inveigle him into marriage; and evidently Sir Charles Berkeley thought he was doing him a favour in circulating lying stories about her.

When told by Charles of his daughter's situation, Clarendon manifested deep, and probably real, distress. Her underhand if virtuous manœuvre tended to compromise his honour; the marriage might greatly hamper his political influence; and he thought fit to declare that he would rather submit to the disgrace "than that it should be repaired by making her his wife." The duke's feminine relatives, again, were furiously angry at the lady's presumption, and almost dumfounded at the duke's infatuation. Extremely chagrined at the new position of her maid, the Princess of Orange declared that she would not yield her precedence; and Henrietta Maria, almost distracted with indignant amazement, immediately wrote to the king that she was on her way to England, "to prevent with her authority so great a stain and dishonour to the crown." But Charles was not greatly moved by these feminine reprehensions. Though, after his own fashion, almost as angry with his brother as they were, he could not bring himself to inflict a wrong on the daughter of his most trusted counsellor. The clergy and the judges, whom he had ordered to enquire into the proofs of the private marriage, having reported that it was perfectly legal, but for the lack of his consent, he told his too late repentant brother "that he must drink as he had brewed and live with her whom he had made his wife." A formal marriage, according to the rites of the Church of England was, therefore, celebrated on

3rd September, at Worcester House, Clarendon's residence in the Strand, some weeks before the lady gave birth to a son; and Charles graciously assured Clarendon that he was "perfectly satisfied with the arrangement, that his daughter was a woman of great wit and parts," and that, with the advantage of his advice, she would exert the best of influences on her husband.

The tragi-comedy ended with the extension to the Duchess of Henrietta Maria's condescending forgiveness. She had declared to Charles, "if that woman is brought to Whitehall by one door, I shall go out at the other and never return to it"; but a letter from Mazarin suggested the advisability of another attitude; and when the duke and duchess came to the New Year's dinner at Whitehall, she, on the duchess kneeling to her, "raised her, kissed her, and placed her at table"; and, later, she told Clarendon that she was resolved to live with all the affection of a mother towards them. The duchess, Pepys states, "was a plain woman like her mother"; and her portraits indicate a robustness that renders credible the statement of Grammont that she was "one of the highest feeders in England"; but, as the author of an anonymous *Life of James II.*, printed by F. Knapton, remarks, "it was her misfortune rather than any crime that she had an extraordinary stomach." While her features are fleshy, the eyes are pleasantly, if sharply, intelligent, and the "majestic air," which Grammont also ascribes to her, is, as in the case of her father, manifest enough. Burnet, who deemed her "a very extraordinary woman," affirms that "she soon understood what belonged to a princess and took state on her rather too much." It was common talk of James that "in all things but his amours he was led by the nose by his wife." As an example, Pepys, on the authority of Mr Povy—who was like to lose his

pension of £400 a-year, because the duchess was "a devil against him"—records, 27th January 1667-8, that the duchess "do now come, like Queen Elizabeth, and sit with the Duke of York at council, and sees what they do; and she crosses out this man's wages and prices as she sees fit for saving money, . . . and my Lady Peterborough by-and-by tells me that the duchess do lay up mightily jewels."

But as regards his amours, the duke was not amenable to her discipline. Grave, methodical, generally temperate, professedly pious, and outwardly decorous and demure, he was in love affairs more recklessly unscrupulous and much less wideawake than his careless, pleasure-loving brother. He attempted adventures amongst the wives of the aristocracy, which only one so dull-witted as he would have thought of. Lady Southesk and Lady Robarts were the objects of his desperate though vain solicitudes. So smitten was he with Lady Chesterfield that the duchess complained about it to the king and her father; and the lady's husband thought good to "pack her into the country." He persistently pestered his wife's maid of honour, Frances Jennings, afterwards Duchess of Tyrconnel, who treated his advances with humorous contempt; and after a day's hunting he used vainly to entertain Elizabeth Hamilton—afterwards wife of Count Grammont—with hunting stories and adventures, "until sleep interrupted the conversation."

More accessible was Lady Denham, the young wife of the middle-aged poet, Sir John Denham. On the authority of Pierce, the surgeon, Pepys, 10th June 1666, reports: "The Duke of York is wholly given up to his new mistress, my Lady Denham, going at noonday with all his gentlemen, to visit her in Scotland Yard, she declaring she will not be his mistress, as Mrs Price, to go up and down the privy stairs, but will be owned

publicly, and so she is." Her death towards the end of the year was attributed by the populace to poisoning by her jealous husband, who, says Grammont, appeased their fury by a magnificent funeral. The duke now solemnly declared that he would never have a *public* mistress again, which heroic resolve greatly gladdened the heart of Pepys.

The duke's open patronage of Lady Denham may be partly explained by the duchess's flirtation with the handsome Harry Sidney. Reresby, while affirming that Sidney was much in love with her, states that "the duchess was not unkind to him, but very innocent"; and Grammont says that, on the advice of one of her maids of honour, she pretended to admire Sidney in order to regain her husband's affection. But if there was no real ground for scandal, scandal there was: Sidney was "banished the court, and the duke for many days did not speak to the duchess at all."

It was to the desire of the duchess to recover her influence over her husband that Burnet attributes her acceptance of Catholicism. Some fifteen months before her death she had refrained from attending the Protestant communion, and rumours of her conversion reached the king, who, says Clarke, "took notice of all this to the duke, who owned the truth to him that she was resolved to be a Catholic"; upon which "his Majesty charged the duke to keep it as a great secret, which was accordingly done." So much was Clarendon in the dark as to the duke's own belief that he wrote to her: "You bring irreparable dishonour, scandal and prejudice to the duke your husband"; and he implored "the duke of his authority to rescue her from bringing a mischief upon him and herself."

Meanwhile the duke, until his wife's death in 1671, kept, after a fashion, his quaint resolve not to have a public mistress. When Arabella Churchill, one of the

maids of honour, was found to be with child to him, the scandal was covered by her withdrawal to Moulins in France, where, far from London gossip, she was delivered of a daughter. Unlike her brother, the famous Duke of Marlborough, Miss Churchill was not endowed with the fatal gift of beauty: "a tall creature, pale-faced and nothing but skin and bone," says Grammont, who affirms that she achieved her conquest of the duke through a designed accident in the hunting field.

On the death of the duchess in 1671, the duke developed a strong passion for Lady Bellasis, widow of Sir Henry Bellasis. Though, according to Burnet, she had "a very small proportion of beauty," the duke became so bewitched that he would have repeated the matrimonial vagary of his raw youth but for the king, who "sent for him and told him that it was too much—that he had played the fool once; that was not to be done a second time, and at such an age." The lady had, therefore, to give up the compromising document, and the duke sought consolation for his disappointment by a renewal of his connection with Miss Churchill.

While indefatigable as an amorist, the duke was extremely active in business. According to the *mot* of Buckingham: "the king could understand things if he would and the duke would understand them if he could." Having been confirmed in the office of Lord High Admiral, he, with the assistance of able and diligent officials, set himself strenuously to promote the efficiency of the Navy. What mainly hampered him was lack of supplies, though the secretary of the Navy, Sir William Coventry, did his utmost in the retrenchment of unnecessary expenditure. The duke's policy in the provision of officers tended, however, to interfere with the effectiveness of the service. With a view to make sure of support in view of eventualities,

he "began," says Burnet, "a method of sending pages of honour and other young persons of quality to be bred to the sea. And they were put in command as soon as they were capable, if not sooner." . . . "By this means the virtue and discipline of the navy is much lost."

The duke's interest in the nation's commercial enterprises led him to support the Declaration of War against the Dutch. In May 1665 the fleet under his command set sail for the Texel; but no Dutch fleet appearing, they blockaded the ports and began capturing Dutch merchantmen until driven home by stress of weather. While his fleet was at anchor in Southwold Bay, the Dutch fleet came suddenly in sight; and they came into action on the morning of 3rd June. During the engagement of the *Royal Charles* with the ship of Opdam, the Dutch admiral, the Earl of Falmouth, Lord Muskery and Richard Boyle were killed by the same cannon shot, "their blood and brains," says Pepys, "flying in the duke's face, and the head of Mr Boyle striking down the duke as some say." In the end a shot from the *Royal Charles* having fallen into Opdam's powder magazine, blew up the ship; and this so dismayed the Dutch that they set their ships before the wind and hurried them out of action. By nightfall no fewer than twenty-four of their ships were taken and sunk, and the chase was continued during the night. But the duke having, at eleven o'clock, lain "down upon a quilt in his clothes," to get some sleep, the unwarranted interference of Mr Browncker, a groom of the duke's bedchamber, caused the master of the ship to slacken sail, so that the remainder got safe away. Still the victory, if lucky and insufficiently followed up, was so decisive and great as to arouse unbounded enthusiasm; and when the duke and his friends returned from the sea, "all," says Pepys, "fat and lusty and ruddy from being in the

sun," there was great feasting and rejoicing, although already the terror of the plague was on the town. A medal was struck in commemoration of the victory, and the Commons voted to the duke £20,000. Owing, however, to the representations of Henrietta Maria to the king, as to the danger to which the heir to the throne was exposing himself, the command of the fleet was transferred to the Earl of Sandwich.

The duke zealously took the part of Clarendon when he was attacked by the Commons, and the king's failure to support him led to an estrangement between them. On the outbreak of the war in 1672 he resumed command of the fleet. Though warned by Lord Sandwich, he permitted it to remain at anchor at Southwold Bay after a north-east wind had sprung up, and thus enabled the Dutch to attack him at great advantage, the allied fleet being unable to make full use of its superiority. Then, when the wind changed, the French failed to come to the aid of the English fleet, upon which the Dutch had concentrated their attack. The *Royal James*, Sandwich's ship, was set on fire and sunk, Sandwich, when urged to save his life in a boat, replying, "I see how things go, and I am resolved to perish with the ship." The duke had to transfer himself first from the *Prince* to the *St Michell*, and then to the *London*; but by this time the Dutch attack was slackening, and as evening fell they withdrew their ships out of action. Fifteen disabled ships, left to make their escape as best they could, would all have been captured but for the interposition of a fog. Technically victory lay with the allied fleet; but the battle dimmed rather than augmented the duke's repute.

With this muddled victory the duke's naval career practically closed. Many of the ships had been so severely shattered that two months were needed for repairs; and a succession of autumn storms caused so

many mishaps that it was decided not to risk an attack on the Dutch fleet at anchor in the Weelings. At the Christmas of 1672 the duke had declined to take the sacrament with the king; and on the passing of the Test Act in March 1673, he "carried," says Burnet, "all his commissions to the king, and wept as he delivered them, but the king showed no concern."

According to the duke's own account his doubts of Protestantism dated from the perusal in Flanders of a work written by a bishop in defence of the Protestant schism, and all his subsequent enquiries so convinced him of its sinfulness that "he could rest no longer, so in the year 1672 he withdrew from the communion of the Church of England." The author of the *Secret History of Whitehall* affirms that shortly after the Restoration the duke made known his change of belief to his brother, who "engaged him to put that restraint upon himself as to keep the secret"; and as early as 10th February 1660-61, Pepys, referring to a rumour that the king was married to a niece of the Prince de Ligne, and had two sons by her, remarks that he "is gladder that it should be so than that the duke and his family should come to the crown, he being a professed friend to the Catholics." It was not, however, until 1669 that he sent for Father Simons, and "treated with him about being reconciled to the Church." What he desired was a dispensation from the Pope, permitting his secret reception into the Catholic Church, while he continued outwardly to conform to the observances of the Church of England; but the Pope apparently deemed that the interests of Catholicism would be best served by the duke's public profession of it; and in the end the duke not only succumbed to the pressure, but became in England a more enterprising, if less prudent, Catholic propagandist than the Pope.

Though the duke had eight children by Anne Hyde, only three survived her; and the only son died 8th June 1671. In times so critical a male heir was a supreme desideratum; and having delivered the duke from his foolish entanglement with Lady Bellasis, Charles set about procuring him a bride more suited to his rank. Negotiations were carried on for the hand of the Archduchess of Innsbruck; but just as Peterborough, in February 1672, was proceeding as envoy extraordinary to complete them, news reached him at Calais that the Emperor had resolved to marry the princess himself. Peterborough was, however, instructed to proceed to Paris, where he received from Charles the names of four ladies—the Duchess of Guise, Mary of Modena, Mademoiselle de Krais, and the Princess of Wurtemberg,—of whom he was “to endeavour by all diligence he could to get sight and knowledge,” or “at least their pictures and most important relations of their manners and dispositions.” Peterborough, in his *Memoirs*, gives interesting details of his quest; but it must suffice to state that through the interposition of Louis XIV. he was directed to break off negotiations, then in progress, for the hand of the Princess of Wurtemberg and to proceed to Italy to demand that of the Princess of Modena. He was very favourably impressed with her. She appeared to be “about fourteen years of age; she was tall and admirably shaped, her complexion was of the last fairness, her hair black as jet, so were her eyebrows and her eyes, and the latter so full of light and sweetness as that they did dazzle and charm too.” At first the Duchess of Modena seemed not to favour the proposal, and the princess was even more set against the match than her mother. She entreated Peterborough, “with tears in her eyes, that if he had interest in his master, he would oblige her

by endeavouring yet to divert any further persecution of a maid who had an irreconcilable aversion to the marriage." In the end the "offices of France" induced the parents to give their consent; and though the Pope was slow to grant a dispensation, and without it the Bishop of Modena declined to perform the ceremony, an English Jacobin was found willing to risk the possible penalties of doing so; and, Peterborough acting as proxy, the marriage took place on 30th September.

For two days and nights thereafter the young bride indulged in almost inconsolable fits of weeping, and she was only partially quieted by her mother's promise to accompany her to England. During the journey a serious illness caused her to rest some weeks in Paris; and her feelings towards her husband when she first met him could, she afterwards confessed, be expressed only by tears. At Dover the marriage was confirmed by Crewe, Bishop of Oxford, and after staying the night there they continued the journey to London. At Gravesend they were received in state by the king, who welcomed the bride with such charming cordiality as at once to win her attachment. The king, she said later, "was always kind to me, and was so truly amiable and good-natured that I loved him very much." For the duke she did not, for many years, entertain any strong affection. As late as 1679 she declared that she had not had a happy hour since she had been in England. His marriage made no change in his illicit connections. Besides his relations with Miss Churchill, he had an amour with Moll Kirke, daughter of a groom of the bed-chamber to Charles II.; and here he had rivals in the Duke of Monmouth and Lord Mulgrave. Later he succumbed to the charms of the by no means handsome, but clever, corrupt, and irrepres-

sible Catherine Sedley, daughter of Sir Charles Sedley.

The marriage of the duke, a more than suspected Catholic, to the princess of a Catholic house under the patronage of France rather disquieted the nation. The Commons even urged the king to declare the marriage invalid; but he replied that his honour was now involved in the arrangement. At the court the beauty and amiability of the duchess made her a general favourite; but in the country the marriage aggravated the hostility which had begun to set in against the duke. So strong did it become that his friends advised him to retire with the duchess to Audley End or some other quiet retreat in the country, where "he might hunt and pray without offence to any or disquiet to himself." But the duke was of "quite another opinion and resolution"; and but for the king's adroit management of his case he would without doubt have completely ruined his chance of succession to the throne. To save him from the consequences of his imprudence, Charles had to agree to a peace with Holland, and under the auspices of Danby to revert to the Anglicanism of Clarendon. Whatever, therefore, the duke's fond anticipations from a French alliance, he had now to forego them: the king even wrung from him consent to his two daughters, Mary and Anne, being educated as Protestants—an arrangement which, with the marriage of Mary to the Protestant Prince of Orange, was to affect the future of the duke and of Great Britain in a manner then undreamt of. Also, this temporary paltering with his conscience seemed to be made vain by the apparition, in 1678, of Titus Oates, who, after the discovery of Coleman's letters, made no scruple of calling the duke a rascal, a Papist, and a traitor: "he shall be hanged," says he, "and I hope I live to see it: we will have

no more regard for him than if he was a scavenger of Kent Street."

The first step against the duke was a petition of the Commons for the execution of the penal laws against the Catholics. When the king, thereupon, issued a proclamation for the banishment of priests, this was made to apply to the priests of the duchess as those of only a subject, an effort of the king and the duke to elude the Act by including them in the queen's list being negatived by the queen. Then, on 2nd November, Shaftesbury moved in the Lords that the duke should be removed from councils and public affairs, and the king assenting, the duke had no option but to agree, though he did so under protest. The Commons now proposed that he should withdraw from the king's person as well as council; and though the king—by assuring them that they might make what provision they thought fit for safeguarding the Protestant religion—so quieted their apprehensions that in a Bill disabling Papists from sitting in Parliament, a provision was inserted exempting the duke from the penalties of the Act, the lull in the storm was of short duration.

So menacing was the result of the elections to the new Parliament that the king directed his brother to withdraw from the kingdom, and on 27th February 1679 wrote to him: "I think it proper to give you, under my hand, that I expect this compliance from you, and desire it may be as soon as you can." This the duke deemed "extremely adverse to his interests"; but after the king had taken an oath before the council that he was never married to Lucy Walter, the duke and duchess, on 3rd March, set sail for Holland, where, after a short stay with the Prince and Princess of Orange at The Hague, they went to Brussels.

When the king, on 22nd August, was attacked by

a serious illness, he, at the instance of Halifax and Sunderland, sent an express to the duke "to come to him immediately, but with as small a retinue as possible"; and when Monmouth had the audacity to manifest offence, he was directed to resign his office of commander-in-chief and retire to the Continent. Later the duke was appointed High Commissioner to Scotland, to which, after proceeding to Brussels to fetch the duchess, he set out on 22nd October. His reception in Edinburgh was a cordial one. The partial renewal of the old splendours of Holyrood appealed to the patriotism of the citizens, and by their masked balls and other entertainments the duke and duchess made themselves very popular with the burgesses. According to the rather fulsome statement of the Privy Council, "Even the most malicious abstained from all manner of rebellious risings and undutiful speeches—no breach of the peace, no libel, no pasquil having been discovered during his abode here: so that this short time has been the most peaceable and serene part of our life, and the happiest days we ever saw, except your Majesty's miraculous restoration."

The duke was recalled from Scotland in February 1680, but again set out thither in October. Under his auspices "things," according to Burnet, "were so gently carried that there was no cause of complaint." . . . "He advised the bishops to proceed moderately and take no notice of conventicles in houses, and that would put an end to those in the fields. In matters of justice he showed an impartial temper and renewed all propositions relating to trade; and so, considering how much that nation was set against his religion, he made a greater progress in gaining upon them than was expected." What truth there may be as to his callousness in cases of prisoners struck in the boots it is difficult to say, though his

military experiences tended to harden his nerves, and he was also particularly implacable towards conscientious rebels. But what he was mainly intent on was to secure from the Scottish Parliament guarantees that would make possible the succession of a Catholic sovereign to the throne. Two cardinal Acts were passed. The one declared "that no difference of religion," &c., "can alter or divert the right of succession or lineal descent of the crown to the nearest and lawful heir"; the other, while demanding of all holding office an acceptance "of the True Protestant religion contained in the Confession of Faith, recorded in the last Parliament of King James VI.," required also acknowledgment of the king as supreme "over all persons and in all causes as well ecclesiastical as civil," and also an oath that in the subscriber's judgment it was "unlawful for subjects, upon pretence of reformation, or any other pretence whatsoever, to enter into covenants or leagues," &c., &c. As Argyll would take the Test, "only so far as it was consistent with itself and the Protestant religion," he was put on his trial for treason and found guilty. Execution of the sentence was ordered by the king to be postponed; but while his case was under consideration he escaped from Edinburgh Castle and fled to Holland.

Having achieved his main task in Scotland, the duke—though, according to his letter to his niece, the Countess of Litchfield, he was passing his time pleasantly enough in Scotland,—was eager to return; but the king sent Hyde, his brother-in-law, to tell him "in plain terms that unless he would conform and go to church, he must expect no leave to return to court, nor could his Majesty, he said, support him longer but on this condition." The duke was "amazed to find himself blown further back than ever, just when he thought he had weathered the storm"; but

although remonstrances poured in upon him from his friends, representing the dismal state of things if he did not comply, he, as he proudly states, "to their grief as well as his immortal glory," declined compliance, whereupon Lord Hyde pulled a paper out of his pocket written by the king, offering him that "in case he would promise to go to church without doing more, he should have liberty to come to England as soon as the Parliament was up; and on his persisting in a constant denial, my Lord Hyde left him with the comfortless view of being abandoned by all the world." At this crisis, however, the Duchess of Portsmouth asked to be granted an annuity of £5000 out of the Post Office revenues which were settled upon the Duke of York; and though the duke knew that the arrangement could not be carried out without an Act of Parliament, he expressed his willing compliance, and represented that his presence in England would be needful to complete the transaction. Other provision had to be made for the duchess's rapacity; but the cordial manner in which the duke was everywhere received during his visit showed that there was a returning tide of popular opinion in his favour. Early in May 1682 he therefore set out for Scotland, on board the *Gloucester*, to fetch his wife home. Owing to the blundering of the pilot the vessel went ashore on the Yorkshire coast, and many on board perished; but the insinuation of Burnet that the duke showed a too selfish regard for his own safety and that of his dogs and priests, seems to be discounted by the statements of eyewitnesses.

The discovery, in 1683, of the Ryehouse Plot still further strengthened the position of the duke, who also gratified the king by assenting to the marriage of the Princess Anne to the Protestant Prince George of Denmark, and was practically, if not technically,

restored to the charge of the Admiralty and his place in the Privy Council. Much of the routine business of the Administration was entrusted to him; and he hunted and hawked with the king at Windsor and Winchester, and attended him to the races and sports at Newmarket. His one anxiety was the possibility of a reconciliation between the king and Monmouth, for whose return Halifax had been negotiating. Most likely had the king survived a little longer, Monmouth would have returned; and had he been in England at the time of the king's death, the Duke of York's accession might not have been so quietly acquiesced in.

CHAPTER XV.

JAMES II. AND VII.—“QUOS DEUS VULT PERDERE” . . .

THE sovereignty transmitted to James II. was one which, but for his Catholicism, might be reckoned more secure than it had been since the time of Elizabeth. Under the singular auspices of Charles II., its prestige, prerogatives, and authority had, owing to causes which, antecedently, might well be deemed strangely inapposite, been greatly strengthened. During the later years of his reign the main source of disquietude and alarm had been the possibility of a Catholic succession; and he had utilised this alarm in such a fashion as not merely greatly to consolidate his own position, but even to cause a reaction in favour of his brother. The fact that the succession of James had been quietly acquiesced in speaks volumes for the general disinclination, except under strong provocation, to revive either the Catholic or the constitutional controversy. Had James, while retaining his own Catholic convictions, recognised his obligations—as in his speeches to the Council and the Parliament he promised to do—to support and defend the Church of England, his reign might have been happy and prosperous enough, and he might have transmitted to his legitimate successor a sovereignty as unhampered as that which he inherited; and had he even been content to promote the interests of Catholicism in as prudent a fashion as

the Pope advised, his expulsion from the throne might not have been inevitable.

Still his position as a Catholic sovereign of a nation, the Anti-Catholic sentiments of which were so strong and so overwhelmingly preponderant, was an invidious and almost preposterous one. It called for, on his part, a wariness and circumspection of a quite exceptional kind, and a regard for the convictions of others hardly, in those days, compatible with any strong convictions of his own. None of these qualities did James possess. His characteristics were even the very opposite to those which the situation demanded. Just as Charles II. might be reckoned, even in some degree by his faults, especially suited for the rôle of the Restoration king, so it almost required a king with the peculiar idiosyncracies and the strong Catholic convictions of James II. to accomplish the final wreck of the dynasty and of the ancient sovereignty. His amorous propensities excepted, he had little in common with his brother, and as it happened, they indirectly reinforced his zeal as a Catholic propagandist. But for them he was a kind of rude replica of his father. He lacked his ability, he was more dull-witted, but he was quite as strong an ecclesiastical and absolutist zealot. Like him, he deserves the respect due to those who strive to be faithful to their convictions, coupled with the disesteem merited by those who seek ruthlessly to coerce the convictions of others. His case was also at once less excusable and more hopeless than that of his father. In a sense it might be reckoned not altogether inexcusable. We cannot condemn him as we might a sovereign who should now seek to act as he did. To judge him aright we must have regard to his times, and not only so, but to his inherited prepossessions. It was almost inevitable that the Protestant tendency to limit the prerogative

gatives of the ancient sovereignty should create in sovereigns a bias in favour of Catholicism. That bias had begun to manifest itself in James I., though both he and Charles I. were opposed to Popery as a kind of rival to sovereignty. Charles II., again, whatever his personal beliefs, would, if he could, have Catholicised Great Britain; but his very shrewd perceptions as to practical possibilities forbade any definite attempt to do so. James II., quite lacking the shrewd perceptions of his brother, and much more dominated than he by Catholic convictions, felt impelled both by them and an excessive notion of his sovereign prerogatives to attempt what Charles resiled from, the transformation of Protestant Britain into a Catholic Utopia. He can hardly be condemned for cherishing such a fond day-dream; but if in a sense it was chivalrous, it was madly foolish to endeavour to realise it; and the methods employed towards this end were as unjustifiable as they were inept. In the case of one who, apart from his amorous gallantry, was generally straightforward and honest, they can be accounted for only by certain moral eccentricities created in a narrow and somewhat obtuse understanding by Catholic and absolutist fanaticism.

In view of the secret Catholic day-dreams of James, his speech to the council immediately after his brother's death was the reverse of candid. As taken down by Solicitor-General Heneage Finch, his declaration about the Church of England was: "I shall make it my endeavour to preserve the government both in Church and State as by law established. I know the principles of the Church of England are for monarchy, and the members of it have shown themselves good and loyal subjects, and therefore I shall always take care to defend and support it." In his *Life* it is naïvely affirmed that "he was afterwards convinced it had been better

expressed by assuring them that he would never endeavour to alter the established religion, rather than that he would endeavour to preserve it, and that he would rather support and defend the professors of it rather (*sic*) than the religion itself"; but at the opening of the Parliament he gave the same unqualified and emphatic pledge, even adding, "I have chosen to give you this assurance in the same words I used at my first coming to the crown, the better to evidence to you that I spoke them not by chance."

But while posing to the Parliament as an emphatic supporter of the Protestant Church of England, he conveyed to the French ambassador the impression that, notwithstanding the aversion of the nation, his aim would be to establish Catholicism; and though his statements to Barillon were intended to secure a continuance of the subsidy paid to the late king, the chances are a hundred to one that they most nearly represented his desires, if not his deliberate intentions. But after all he did not pretend to have other reasons for supporting the Church of England than that its principles were for monarchy, and meanwhile his aim was that not merely his Catholicism, but his designedly flaunting profession of it, should be quietly acquiesced in.

To Nonconformists his Declaration could give but cold comfort. On the other hand, the pulpits of the Church of England "were," we are told by Burnet, "full of it and of thanksgiving for it. The common phrase was, we have the word of a king and a word never yet broken"; and loyal addresses poured in upon him couched "in such terms that there were no jealousy or fears left."

Although in his speech to the Council he refrained from uttering a syllable about his own personal religious purposes, he had resolved, while entirely ignoring the services of the State Church, to make his Catholicism

as much as possible "to shine before men." "As soon," we are told, "as his Majesty had despatched what was necessary to be done in council, he was impatient to assist at his devotions on so extraordinary an occasion, so went immediately to mass with the queen in the little chapel in St James's, where, according to his free and generous temper, he caused the doors to be left open, that all the world might see his present grandeur was incapable of influencing him in matters relating to his duty to God as his sufferings had been."

In the disposal of the chief offices of State he showed caution and discretion. As it is put in his *Life*, he took care "to temper his kindness so to his friends as not to exasperate such as had been his enemies." He made but little change in the personality of the Ministry. With Pepys as Secretary, he himself undertook the charge of the Navy. The Lordship of the Treasury was transferred to his brother-in-law, Lord Rochester; but Godolphin was appointed Lord Chamberlain to the queen, and became one of the king's tools. Rochester's elder brother, Lord Clarendon, was made Lord Privy Seal in place of Halifax, who, as he formerly said of Rochester, was now "kicked upstairs," by succeeding Rochester as Lord President of the Council. The equivocal Sunderland retained the office of Secretary. Ormonde was recalled from Ireland, but no new Lord-Lieutenant was immediately appointed. Guildford, whose base connivance at the mendacity of Oates and Bedloe must have filled James at one time with terror and horror, was permitted to retain the Great Seal, but divided the duties of his office with Sir George Jeffreys, Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, whose first service was to advise that the customs settled on Charles for life should meanwhile be levied by his successor without the sanction of Parliament.

It was the hope and desire of Louis that James would not summon a Parliament, but had he neglected to do so he would have aroused more than the old Anti-Catholic alarm. Nor is it unlikely that he preferred to shake himself free, if he conveniently could, from the shackles of France. He was a more single-minded patriot than his brother had been. In recommending to the Parliament "the care of the Navy, the strength and glory of this nation," he assured them that he had "a true English heart, as jealous of the honour of the nation as you can be." But the predominant motives of his policy were those of sovereign absolutism and Catholic propagandism. Which was the stronger 'twere hard to say; the one strengthened and fortified the other. On their behalf the calling of a Parliament was a preliminary and necessary evil. Its dissolution or retention would depend upon what he might deem its value to himself. The one disadvantage was that it would be a Parliament of Protestants. The machinery perfected by the late king was now utilised by him with such strenuous and unscrupulous zeal, "that," says Burnet, "when the elections were all returned the king said there were not forty members but such as he himself wished for." But for his own Catholicism, he could not have desired a more apt instrument to give effect to his will; but even to this extremely, and it may be even basely, loyal Parliament, he could not reveal his real ecclesiastical hopes and intentions. Meanwhile, notwithstanding his ostentatious display of his own Catholic convictions, he found it impossible to escape doing a certain ostensible violation to them in connection with the ceremonies of his coronation. He could not dispense with the cardinal Protestant functions of the ceremony; and by directing that the communion services and the presentation to him of the heretic English Bible should be

omitted, he merely emphasised the falseness of his position. Yet Macaulay quite misdescribes his motives and intentions when he states that he "chose to commit what was little short of an act of apostacy rather than forego the childish pleasure of being invested with the gorgeous symbolicals of kingly power." It would, in fact, have been mere madness to have proposed to dispense with the public Protestant ceremony. But before he set out for the public coronation he had, as we now know, been crowned and anointed in private by the Catholic hands of his own confessor, Mansuete, some of the holy oil of Rheims being, 'tis said, sent by Louis XIV. for this purpose. Thus the public ceremony was, in his view and that of his religious advisers, a mere empty formality, meant to cast dust in the eyes of his Protestant subjects.

More consistent with his flaunting ecclesiasticism was his resolve to reform the manners of the court. "The face of the whole court," says the sedate Evelyn, "was exceedingly changed into a more solemn and moral behaviour, the new king affecting neither profaneness nor blasphemy." But this was mainly the cleansing of "the outside of the cup and platter"; and the king was also more set on taking the mote out of the eyes of others than the beam out of his own eye; or he found the latter operation too difficult for him. "Soon after his coming to the crown," he did, Burnet tells us, promise the "queen and his priests that he would see Mrs Sedley no more"; but, unhappily, this was more easily said than done, for his accession made the lady only the more reluctant to part with him. She even aspired to occupy with him a position of similar influence to that of the Duchess of Portsmouth with Charles II. As a Protestant, the priests were dead against her; but the king was almost as much afraid of her as attached to her. To induce her to vacate her

lodgings in Whitehall he gave her a house in St James's Square with £2000 a-year; but very soon their relations were resumed, nor did he discontinue his more transient amours.

Having, doubtless after receiving a Catholic dispensation, deluded the nation with a fraudulent Protestant coronation; having, doubtless with a certain muddled conscientiousness, gratified the ecclesiastical guardians of morality by reforming the manners of his court; and having, in lack of strength to abstain from his conjugal infidelities, arranged for their less obtrusive observance, the next step of this sedate and serious monarch was to secure from a packed, yet Protestant, Parliament such pecuniary terms as would enable him to carry on his campaign of Catholic propagandism in comparative security. The Scottish Parliament, besides annexing in perpetuity to the crown the excise granted to the late king, voted to James an additional £18,000. The English Parliament, in accordance with his pointed request, assigned him for life the revenues granted to the late king; and a few days afterwards, on his representation that additional money was needed for payment of his brother's debts, the repression of Argyll's rebellion, and the replenishment of the navy stores—voted additional taxes for eight years, which augmented his income to about two millions.

In the interests of the Scottish Episcopal Church the Scottish Parliament enacted that "all such as shall hereafter preach at, or frequent, as also such as shall be present at, field conventicles, shall be punished by death and confiscation of their goods"; but though the proposed policy of the English Parliament towards Non-conformity was somewhat similar, it was not so consonant with the king's wishes. When a committee of the English House of Commons proceeded to ask him to put into execution the penal laws against those who

refused to conform to the Church of England, the Commons were given to understand that he was deeply grieved at the suggestion, whereupon they reversed the committee's decision, and contented themselves by expressing their reliance on his declaration to support the Church of England.

The futile expeditions of Argyll and Monmouth enabled James, at the beginning of his reign, to rid himself of enemies who, later, might have proved much more formidable. But among the Nonconformists the severities meted out to Monmouth's followers were to prove a heavy handicap to the later efforts of James to win their confidence. Nor can it be doubted that he was himself primarily responsible for their ruthless character. Indeed, the "Bloody Jeffreys" solemnly asserted that he had been less severe than the king expected him to be. His treatment of Monmouth displayed also a singular lack of moral delicacy. That he sent him to execution is not surprising. In his *Life* we are told that it would have been "the most hazardous and impolitic thing in the world to leave the factious party such a handle to shake the foundations of the throne whenever it pleased to do it." But then, if Monmouth's execution was imperative, how mean was it to tempt him to make disclosures in the hope of pardon! And still more disconcerting is the conduct of James in permitting Monmouth to humiliate himself before him by vain supplication. All this indicates a certain mental and moral insensibility, which accounts for much that is obnoxious in his career as a sovereign.

Riddance from Monmouth was an immense relief to James; but it made him less chary than he might otherwise have been of adopting a course of action which suddenly filled even devoted loyalists with amazement and alarm. Before the Parliament re-assembled on 9th November, he had mooted to the

council a proposal for the repeal of the Test and Habeas Corpus Acts; and Halifax, on account of his strong opposition to this reactionary policy, had been deprived of the Lord Presidency of the Council, which was bestowed on the false and fawning Sunderland. The proposals were not brought before the Parliament; but in his speech to the two Houses on their reassembling, James announced that he had resolved, for his own security against such rebellion as had taken place, "to keep a good force of well-disciplined troops in constant pay," for which he asked provision by additional supply; and he further informed them that he had decided to retain some officers in this army not qualified by the Test Act. "I will deal plainly with you," he said, "that after having had the benefit of their services in such a time of need and danger, I will neither expose them to disgrace nor myself to the want of them, if there should be another rebellion to make them necessary for me."

On the majority of the members the effect of his speech was not quite what he anticipated. While resolving to bring in a Bill to increase the military efficiency, they declined to grant supply towards the support of the additional forces. For the expenses incurred by the rebellion they proposed to grant some additional supply; but before proceeding further, they presented him with an address in which, while stating that they were preparing a Bill to indemnify the officers from the penalties incurred by not taking the Test, they humbly pointed out that these officers cannot by law be capable of their employment." Finally, it was decided that the supply should not exceed £700,000; and while ways and means were still under consideration, the king's answer was received. It expressed his royal displeasure at receiving "such an address"; and after listening to a

debate in the Lords, which showed their intention to support the Commons, he, before the additional supply was voted, suddenly, on 10th November, prorogued the Parliament until 18th February. It never again transacted any business. After being twice prorogued in 1686, it was dissolved in 1687. "And so," says Burnet, "he threw off a body of men that were in all other respects sure to him, and that would have accepted a very moderate satisfaction from him at any time."

The sudden prorogation of the Parliament deepened and widened the Protestant suspicion and alarm awakened by his speech. The immense sensation produced in the previous October by the Edict of Nantes had also greatly quickened the Anti-Catholic sentiment. With great seeming kindness the king, besides subscribing from the privy purse £1500 for the Huguenot refugees who came pouring into England, ordered collections to be made on their behalf throughout the country. Later he required that, before receiving anything, they should conform to the Church of England; but whatever the motives of his charity or the reasons of his stipulations, they did nothing to remove the uneasiness caused by his relations with the Parliament. Writing shortly after its prorogation, the Tuscan ambassador, Terriesi, reports "prognostics of great danger in this kingdom" from the suspicion that the king was "resolved to promote the Catholic religion as has been done in France by the most Christian king," which, he affirms, could not be done "without miraculous assistance"; for, says he, there is "not the slightest doubt that the soldiers would be the first to turn against him."

A certain touch of comic relief was now given to the situation by the announcement, 19th January 1686, that Catherine Sedley had been created Countess of Dorchester, with the intention that she should appear

at court. Barillon reported the belief of the Catholics that this had been done by some cabal in which one of the Ministers was involved; and later surmised that the lady was specially encouraged by Lord and Lady Rochester. On this and a similar report of Bonrepeaux, Macaulay represents Rochester as "stooping to the wicked and shameful part of a procurer, and calling on his wife to aid him." It may be that the honour done by the king to his Protestant mistress was intended to allay Protestant alarm, but most likely she owed it mainly to her own insistence and the king's infatuation. Barillon states that the news caused much agitation at court, and Evelyn chronicles that the queen took the affair "very grievously, so that for two dinners, standing near her, I observed she hardly ate one morsel, nor spoke one word to the king nor any about her." But even more upset than the queen were the queen's Catholic advisers. The priests told him, records Burnet—who is, in substance, corroborated by Barillon—that "a blemish in his life blasted their designs"; . . . "the king was much moved with this, and was out of countenance by what he had done. But to quiet them all, he promised that he would see the lady no more, and pretended that he gave her the title in order to the breaking with her more decently." Even, however, if his assurance was more than half true, he had to reckon with the lady and his own strong inclinations. In her characteristically downright fashion, she wrote to him: "The queen, my lady, loves not her lord's true and faithful mistress, and perhaps in that there is nothing to surprise either of us; but if your loving Catherine must be sacrificed and driven from the presence of her good lord, the king, let it be for reasons of my lady, the queen, and not for the jealous hatred of cunning priests." Meanwhile, some kind of compliance with the king's temporary attack of con-

science could not be avoided. She therefore crossed over to Ireland, but in a few months she was back again in her house in St James's Square. She also, besides taking a seat at St Anne's, Soho, boldly showed herself at court, and only the king's threat to deprive her of her pension induced her to retire into greater obscurity, where the old relations were renewed. Latterly she occupied Ham House, Weybridge; but, as Macaulay remarks, she was "only one of several abandoned women who at this time shared with his beloved Church, the dominion over his mind."

It may suffice to denote in outline the course of James in the crazy ecclesiastical crusade which ended in his ruin. After the prorogation of the Parliament, he thought fit to confirm the rumour that the late king had died a confessed and shrieved Catholic, publishing as irrefragable proofs of his assertion the papers from his strong box. Before this publication, he had shown the papers to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and challenged him and the whole bench of bishops to pen a reply to them. After causing a large impression to be struck off, he dispersed copies amongst the chief dignitaries of the Church and State, and even amongst the crowd which saluted him in the streets. His hope was that he would thus reap some kind of Catholic harvest; but, alas! he was merely sowing dragons' teeth which were to spring up against him as armed men.

Having prorogued the Parliament until May, and then in May until November, James next proceeded to obtain from the courts of law a decision that in particular cases he could dispense with the penalties of the Test Act. To obtain this decision he, in peremptory military fashion, did not scruple to browbeat individual judges in private, and those whose honour as guardians of the law was proof against all persuasion and threats

he dismissed from their offices. "I am determined," said he, "to have twelve judges who will be all of my mind in this matter." By unceremonious dismissal he did get his twelve judges, all but one; and he got his fateful decision: but by thus frankly poisoning justice at its fountain-head, he was merely killing the nation's loyalty. The supplementing of his decision to retain a standing army of 13,000 men, by an attempt to subvert the law in order that, to any extent he pleased, it might be officered by Catholics, was bound to create widespread distrust of his ultimate intentions; and this was strongly confirmed by the wholesale use he was now making of his assumed dispensing power.

Too much might have been made, had it stood alone, of the fact that two beneficed clergymen, who had become Catholics, were permitted to retain their emoluments, while they engaged curates to perform the services according to the Anglican rites; but that this was part of a comprehensive design was shown both by the permission of Catholic perverts to retain high offices in the University and by the appointment of Catholics to these offices; and the institution of Catholic services in certain of the colleges was a still more brazen violation of his promise to support and defend the Church of England. Even more menacing was the appointment to sees, as they fell vacant, of bishops whose only outstanding recommendation was their Papal inclinations; and when he illegally revived the Court of High Commission simply with a view to muzzle the mouths of the clergy from preaching against the Church of Rome, it became hard to tell where he would stop in his efforts to secure the reinstatement of Catholicism in its ancient supremacy. True, an attack on the religion of the king might be deemed, indirectly, an attack on himself; but it was to himself that the falseness of his position was due; and,

moreover, he had published what he asserted to be a royal attack on Protestantism, the religion established by law; and in opposition to the law he was erecting in various parts of the country chapels for the public celebration of Catholic worship, and founding religious houses and schools with a view to a special propagandist crusade. Nor was it on the abatement of the old ecclesiastical antagonisms that he was bent, but—conscientiously, fanatically, and unscrupulously—on the re-establishment of Catholicism.

Even in Scotland he was not now content with the Protestant Episcopalianism which his grandfather had sought to construct as the best available buttress to sovereignty, which his father's fatal imprudences, though against his intentions, had almost ruined, but which, under the auspices of his brother, had partly by means, partly in spite, of a ruthless persecution, begun to obtain a pretty firm hold on the country. In his dealings with Scotland the chief depositories of his confidence were the two Secretaries of State, the Earl of Perth and his brother Lord Melfort, who had declared themselves converted to Catholicism by the Catholic tracts attributed to Charles II. The Duke of Queensberry being unable to report a similar ecclesiastical metamorphosis, Lord Melfort succeeded him as commissioner to the Scottish Parliament, and in the king's letter to it the immediate repeal was recommended of the penal laws "against his innocent subjects of the Roman Catholic religion." But clearly he did not mean to stop at this. Contrary to their oaths—foolish oaths, no doubt, but such was ecclesiasticism in those days—to adhere to Protestantism during all the days of their lives, some of the chief Scottish dignitaries had become perverts to Catholicism; and contrary to the law—whether a foolish law or not—he was, besides maintaining them

in office, making it clear that the best way to win his favour and high office was the profession of Catholicism. But since every member of Parliament had sworn never to give his consent to any change or alteration contrary to the Protestant religion contained in the Confession of Faith, it was hardly to be expected that, in reply to his letter, the majority would do more than assure him that they "would go as great lengths therein as their consciences would permit." Nor would the Lords of the Articles—though the more recalcitrant of them were dismissed—go further than suggest to the Parliament that Catholics might be permitted to hold services in private houses. Even this proposal the Parliament refused to pass, and was therefore adjourned; and he now proposed to announce his fiats to the nation by means of a servile Privy Council. To them he explained that to ask the Parliament to dispense with the Acts against the Catholics was to the Parliament mere courtesy on his part; and he informed them that it was his sovereign will that the judges should be instructed to treat all the laws against them as null, and that a church for their use should be fitted up within the palace of Holyrood. For this startling procedure he relied on the enactment he himself got passed, requiring all persons in public employment to swear that "the king's Majesty was the only supreme governor of this realm over all persons and in all causes as well ecclesiastical as civil"; but even so, they had also to swear that they "should never consent to any change or alteration contrary thereto and inconsistent with the Protestant Confession of Faith." Moreover, the kind of supremacy he claimed was one wholly independent of law, and even if it had not done violence to the law, he was claiming it for a purpose which was bound to alienate

him from the hearts of the bulk of the nation of both kingdoms.

In Ireland the prosecution of a Catholic policy was easier and more justifiable. It might have been quite justifiable had he had only Ireland to consider and not her relations with Great Britain. Being, however, an Irish sovereign merely by virtue of being sovereign of England, he was acting neither wisely nor fairly in seeking violently to reverse the positions of the Protestant colonists and the Popish Celts. Still had he followed a strictly Protestant policy in England and Scotland, his strongly Catholic policy in Ireland might not have aroused in England and Scotland the alarm that it did. It was not a groundless alarm: his aim was to make Ireland a kind of rallying centre for an attack on the Protestantism of Britain. In Ireland an army could be collected on which reliance could be placed for any service required of it on behalf of Catholicism; and such an army he now set himself to organise.

When Ormonde was recalled from Ireland, Richard Talbot, now created Earl of Tyrconnel, whose relations with James had been extremely confidential, if rather unsavoury, was sent to Ireland to reorganise the army. When, therefore, Clarendon, in January 1686, landed in Ireland as lord-lieutenant, it was to discover that measures were being taken for placing the army, the legislature, and the civil government in the hands of the Catholics. If he remained he had no option but to fall in with this arrangement, and the king even cherished hopes that he would himself see the propriety of becoming a Catholic. Very soon also he set himself to effect the conversion of Rochester; but neither brother would succumb either to his wiles or threats. When, therefore, in June 1686, Tyrconnel returned to Ireland with the powers of commander-

in-chief, the position of Clarendon became extremely humiliating; and in the following summer he was formally superseded by Tyrconnel.

Not only were Catholics now permitted to hold the highest offices of State, but the profession of Catholicism was becoming a *sine qua non* for these offices. James did not contemplate the establishment of a semi-Catholic, semi-Protestant State — then a mere impossibility: he was bent on a complete ecclesiastical revolution. He was even set on effecting this with an imprudent haste of which the Catholic authorities did not approve. The Earl of Castlemaine was now sent as ambassador-extraordinary to Rome, in order “to reconcile the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland to the Holy See, from which, for more than an age, they had fallen off by heresy.” As a means, or an outward recognition of this, a cardinal’s hat was suggested for Father Petre; but since, so far as the hat was concerned, the mission—of the object of which little was known in England—was a failure, it did not cause, thanks to the Pope’s common-sense, the consternation it might otherwise have done.

Of the headstong acts of James, that which aroused the deepest Protestant alarm amongst the educated and upper classes was his sensational raid on the universities. The arbitrary attempt to force Catholic officials on Protestant colleges, and the claim to transform the colleges at his pleasure into Catholic institutions, was not merely an open insult to the chief representatives of the nation’s learning and culture: it meant the poisoning of the springs of Protestantism at their fountain-head. But probably this was a less inevitably fatal step than his bid for the support of the Nonconformists against the Church of England. In Scotland the bid was grudging and stingy. It was with the utmost reluctance that he could here

bring himself to go so far as he went. To the Scottish Catholics he granted more unrestrained liberty than he could, even in the end, be persuaded to grant to the Presbyterians. Officiating Presbyterian ministers—who were permitted “to worship God after their own way and manner”—had to obtain a licence from the Government as politically inoffensive. The Declaration of Indulgence for England, 4th April 1687, was more comprehensive and unstinted. Besides repealing the penal laws against Protestant Nonconformists as well as Catholics, it dispensed with all religious tests for the holding of any civil or military office. This Macaulay curiously denounces “as the most audacious of all the attacks made by the Stuarts on freedom.” True, it implied an audacious disregard of the rights or claims of the Parliament, though hardly so audacious as the notorious ones of Cromwell. But were not the penal laws themselves, rather than the suspension of them, an attack on public freedom? Still, (1) the Declaration of Indulgence was at least an audacious violation of law, and (2) it was primarily dictated not by zeal for religious liberty but for Catholic absolutism. Its aim was to secure the sympathy and support of the Nonconformists for the removal of Catholic disabilities, with a view to the establishment of Catholic supremacy. If with that supremacy James intended to combine, as for a time was done in France, toleration to Protestants, it was the establishment of Catholic supremacy and sovereign absolutism that was his one great concern.

He might well, extreme Catholic as he was, consider his aim more than permissible, just as the Protestant Episcopalians, the English Nonconformists, and the Scottish Presbyterians deemed the supremacy of their respective ecclesiasticisms essential to Britain’s true religious welfare; but however that may be, his

aim was still more chimerical than theirs and his methods still more misguided. The Nonconformists had in the past been the chief enemies of sovereign absolutism and the most bitter opponents of Catholic toleration. As a Catholic he was occupying the throne virtually in spite of their protests; and since his accession he had been doing almost everything possible to justify the worst fears of his intentions. They did not love, they would not if they could, tolerate the Episcopal Church of England. They deemed it merely an outer court of Catholicism. For a time they had abolished it; and on its re-establishment as the State church, the whirligig of time had brought on them its revenges. From these revenges James was, in a fashion, offering them deliverance. If he did not propose to reinstate them in supremacy as under Cromwell, the boon of relief from ecclesiastical persecution might well be deemed almost priceless. Yet the price he asked of them was too exorbitant; for their aversion to the Church of England was a mere nothing compared with their horror of the Church of Rome. Besides, he had estranged them beyond all hope of reconciliation by the cruelties of the Bloody Assize. All the perfumes of Arabia could not sweeten to them a reputation tainted by its association with such a series of revengeful atrocities. His belated message of goodwill merely deepened, therefore, their distrust and augmented their antipathy; while by thus mortally offending the Cavaliers, he was depriving himself of the main buttress of his sovereignty.

While by some the rash policy of James on behalf of Catholicism has been attributed to the sinister machinations of Sunderland, by others its instigation has been assigned to Father Petre; but neither theory seems necessary to account for it. Sunderland did give him much bad advice and pernicious encourage-

ment, but mainly, we must suppose, because it was the advice and encouragement that would be agreeable to James. On the other hand, Father Petre, unlike Sunderland, was a sincere and not a sham Catholic; but he may have supported James in his more unwise measures, largely because he deemed it inexpedient in his own interests, as well as vain in those of the king, to interfere with his headstrong folly. If, however, Father Petre did give his blessing to the most of his imprudences, the highest Jesuit authorities were by no means so indiscriminating in their approval of them. Indeed it is now known that the General of the Jesuits was never more surprised than when he learned that the English Provincial had granted permission to Father Petre to become a Privy Councillor. Terriesi also wrote that no one was more alarmed at it than the Papal Nuncio, who would also have much preferred that James had not given to the Nuncio a public and solemn reception at Windsor. The English Catholics generally were in fact dismayed rather than elated at "such proceedings"; and, says Terriesi, were showing themselves "more than ever averse to the ardour with which his Majesty was promoting their interests."

As if the issue of the Declaration of Indulgence were not in itself sufficiently offensive to the Church of England, James, after, on 27th April 1688, issuing a new one, made, on 4th May, an order in council that on two successive Sundays it should be read in every church and chapel in the kingdom. This led to the famous petition of the seven bishops, their trial and their acquittal, to the wild and tumultuous rejoicing of London and the general enthusiasm of the nation. His position had now become extremely perilous. Although he was on the best of terms with himself and quietly confident of success, there was no safety for him but in

speedy retreat, and to proceed further was only to hasten his own perdition.

To certain Catholics who deprecated his excessive "haste to establish their faith," James replied: "I am growing old and must take large steps, else, if I happen to die, I might perhaps leave you in a worse condition than I found you." Did he then imagine that within the short span of years that at the longest might be allotted to him, he might so transform the nation's religion as to be able to exclude his daughters from the throne unless they became Catholics? "God," he said, "will take care of that; leave the conversion of my daughters to me." By a series of elaborate letters he did, Burnet tells us, make a systematic effort to catholicise the Princess of Orange; but he obtained from her no more satisfactory reply than that "the religion which she professed taught her her duty to him, so that she should ever be his most obedient daughter and servant." A scheme, in which the Papal Nuncio was concerned, was also mooted for bribing the Princess Anne and her husband by recognising her in place of her sister in the succession. Unless, however, a son were born to James, the difficulty of permanently establishing in Britain the Catholic faith might well be deemed insuperable: the delusive Catholic supremacy he might set up was bound to collapse even more utterly than it did on the accession of Elizabeth at the death of Queen Mary, and the position of Catholicism was certain to become more dismal than ever. Fanatically convinced as James was of the divinity of his mission, he may very well have cherished a secret and fervent assurance that Heaven would specially interpose on his behalf and graciously grant him a son and heir to establish completely the work of his hands. This also Heaven appeared to do, when a son was born to him and the queen on 10th June

1688 — born when hope might well have become despair, for five years had elapsed since the birth of the last of a number of children, who had all speedily sickened and died. But to James and the Catholics this striking intervention of Providence was to prove less a benefaction than an unmitigated misfortune. For both it might even have been better if James Francis Edward had never been born. Ill-luck seemed to have marked him for its own. Without him, it is true, Jacobitism would have been shorn of its romance; it would have perished prematurely; the '15 and the '45, with their picturesque incidents and melancholy futilities, would have had no place in our annals; but James might possibly have kept his crown even to the end of his days; and the dread and jealousy of Catholicism—with the consequent Catholic hardships and disabilities—would not have been so kept alive as it was by the possibilities of a Catholic succession.

The singular sensation caused by the male birth, the immense gratification of the king and his Catholic satellites, the agitated chagrin and contemptuous incredulity of the Protestants, brought about an acute crisis of the old antagonisms. What in the eyes of the pious Catholics was a special token of Heaven's favour suggested to the godly Protestants merely unscrupulous fraud. Already James had almost convinced them that he would stick at nothing to secure Catholic supremacy; and they reasoned that the necessities of a male heir being so clamant, he and the Catholics would not hesitate to provide a fictitious one should a legitimate one be unobtainable.

The suddenness of the queen's illness and certain other circumstances tended also to augment the Protestant incredulity. The explanation that she had miscalculated her time by a month evoked only the ribald mockery of the London populace; and the

fact that she had been playing cards almost till in the small hours of Sunday morning she was suddenly carried to St James's, where the birth took place when most people were at church, added to the suspicions of imposture. It also unfortunately happened that among those absent were three persons of prime importance. The Princess Anne had gone to Bath; the Archbishop of Canterbury was included in the seven bishops who just two days previously had been sent to the Tower; and Clarendon got the news of the birth only on the way home from the Protestant devotions of Trinity Sunday. Previously the Princess Anne had expressed more than surprise at the queen's reported pregnancy: indeed months before the birth Terriesi reported that she was making no secret of her wrathful incredulity; and the fact that the asserted event took place when she could not possibly be present was not fitted to remove it. She also infected the Princess of Orange with her own strong sentiments; and their written confidences make it quite clear that they were ingenuously convinced that a gross fraud was being perpetrated against them and their Protestant faith.

In the end it might have mattered little to the Prince of Orange whether he or his wife were convinced of the fraud or not. His objection was to the danger to himself and Continental Protestantism of his father-in-law's Catholic policy and a permanent Catholic succession in Britain. Still, the general conviction of fraud being so providentially convenient, he was thoroughly inclined to acquiesce in it. On the first news of the birth he had sent Zulestein formally to congratulate his royal relatives; but when Zulestein reported that in England not one person in ten believed the queen to be the mother of the child, he ceased to commit himself to an opposite opinion. When also, shortly afterwards, he received an invitation from seven

leading Protestant lords and others, pledging themselves, should he make a descent on England, to aid him to the utmost of their power, he recognised that the hour for action had struck, and at once began preparations for his momentous enterprise. The members of the court received, therefore, a hint not to attend the grand fête in honour of the birth, given on 10th July by the English ambassador at the Hague; prayers for the Prince of Wales were ordered to be discontinued in his chapel; and in his Declaration of 30th September he gave as one of the reasons for his expedition to England, the "grave suspicion he entertained as to the royal parentage of him who was termed the Prince of Wales."

Without the aid of the Prince of Orange the problem of how to oppose the Catholic crusade of James would have been a very puzzling one. Hence his strong sense of security. Should the nation's eyes become so blinded and its heart so hardened as to lead it to regard him as no longer worthy to occupy the throne, the only feasible successor to him was either the Princess of Orange or the Princess Anne,—but how to credit that his own daughters, Protestants though they were, would consent to become the agents or abettors of his ruin?

The Princess of Orange and her stepmother had got to be on intimately friendly terms during the visit of James and his wife to the Hague at the time of the Anti-Catholic agitation. The first time Mary of Modena took pen in hand after being brought to bed was to give her "dear Lemon," as she jocularly termed her, all the feminine details about the event; but her "dear Lemon," while replying affectionately, took not the least notice of the child, "any more than if he had never been born," and later so expressed herself as to confirm the queen "in the thought I had before, that you had for

him the last indifference." The deeply grieved lady also wrote that her husband had often told her that though he had frequently mentioned his son to her, she had "never answered anything concerning him"; but the only reply of the princess was that "all the king's children would ever find as much kindness and affection" from her "as can be expected from children of the same father."

Conscious of their innocence, the king and queen might well hope that the Prince and Princess of Orange would yet be sorry for their suspicions; but if to James the misunderstanding did not seem to imply any immediate peril, there were other ominous signs of the great jeopardy in which he stood. For a refusal to pledge himself to vote for the repeal of the Test Act, he had the hardihood to dismiss Admiral Herbert, his most skilful and popular officer, whereupon Herbert entered the Dutch service and was appointed Admiral of North Holland. Then James, Sir John Reresby tells us, found it needful to visit the fleet "to appease the seamen, who were ready to mutiny upon occasion of some sea captains using mass openly about the ships." Calling them his children, he assured them that his only concern was to grant liberty of conscience to all; but the priests had to be sent ashore. But all depended on the attitude of the Prince of Orange, and James was quite blind to the possible peril from this great Protestant prince, until he found himself in direct and fatal conflict with him. Even while the prince was hurrying on his preparations he refused to credit, what almost every one else believed, that a descent on England was intended. On 10th August Evelyn notes information by the Archbishop of Canterbury that "there would suddenly be some great thing discovered. This was the Prince of Orange intended coming over." From the Hague Avaux

having expressed to Louis the same convictions, Louis sent to James an offer of naval assistance, and also directed Avaux to intimate to the States that any armed interference with his friend the King of England would be interpreted as war against France. But this, as he deemed it, gratuitous meddling of Louis was strongly resented by James. It deeply hurt his pride and his fanatical confidence in his own statesmanship. The mere assumption that the prince must be contemplating an attack on him was a wintry blast which bitterly bit his thick self-complacency; and even more mortifying was the apparent assumption that he had so undermined the loyalty of his subjects as to be unable by his own help to defend himself against the Dutch. Skelton, the English ambassador at Paris, whom he deemed mainly responsible for the precipitate action of Louis, was therefore recalled and sent to the Tower; the offer of naval co-operation was passed over in silence; and other proposals of Louis for hampering the action of Holland were treated with indifference.

For some time the prince continued to throw dust in the eyes of James with the assurance and perfect success derived from his knowledge of the man he had to deal with; but to this possibility there was a limit, and once the conviction took hold of James that the surmise of Louis and others must be correct, his self-confidence gave place to something closely allied to panic. This was almost the inevitable consequence of the immense shock to his self-esteem; but had he realised his position, as impartial observers already did, it might have justified even black despair. Thus the Austrian ambassador, Hoffmann—whose letters supply a minute chronicle of the varying phases of the king's strange and unique position—writing on 1st October, sums up his desperate case by affirming that it was really no exaggeration to say that "he had against him all the

clergy, all the nobility, all the people, and the land and sea forces, with very few exceptions"; and the sequel was to show that this hopeless estimate of his position was practically correct.

Who were the ringleaders in the movement against him, and what preparations were being made to support the prince—in regard to this James was completely in the dark; and the mystery began to get on his nerves. In his majestic note a quaver thus began to show itself. A few months previously he had met the acquittal of the bishops with the haughty comment, "so much the worse for them"; and it was his intention to summon not merely them but all the refractory clergymen before the Ecclesiastical Commission; but if still convinced that this was their desert, he now came down from his high horse with a somewhat awkward precipitancy. On 20th September he actually sought the counsel of those of the bishops who were in London, and he now began to bid for the support of the Church, which, a short while ago, he had been treating with overbearing arrogance. But even now he could not bring himself to accept more than the mere fragments of their advice. As of old, he showed a strong partiality for generalities. He issued a Declaration in which, while stating his desire to establish liberty of conscience, he affirmed his resolution to maintain the Church of England in all its rights and prerogatives and to confirm the Acts of Uniformity; and further, he agreed that Catholics should be debarred from becoming members of Parliament. By these partial and mainly vague concessions, and his assurances to the ambassador at the Hague that he had no secret understanding with Louis, he even hoped, at this the eleventh hour, to induce the Prince of Orange to refrain from carrying out his purpose; but when, almost immediately afterwards,

he learned that preparations were going on for an almost instant embarkation, he held, on 8th October, a second meeting with the bishops. Followed a second Declaration, announcing his resolve to preserve the Church of England, restore its charter to the city of London, restore Magdalen College, suppress the Ecclesiastical Commission, and never issue another or grant any mandamus to either university or college, but permit them to transact without any let or interruption; and in the matter of the dispensing power, he was prepared in the next Parliament to make concessions which he trusted would be deemed satisfactory. Later he also published a proclamation re-establishing all the charters and privileges that had been suppressed, removing the Catholic magistrates and closing the Catholic chapels in London.

All this amounted to a considerable reversal of his previous policy; it was a kind of confession of failure and wrongdoing and a promise of amendment. For a king with so high an opinion of his rights and prerogatives it was an immense, and even humiliating, concession. Yet withal it still left the nation in doubt as to matters that were cardinal. His abasement did him therefore, perhaps, more damage than all his previous tampering with law and justice. His lack of resolute courage tended to breed contempt for him, and his sudden change of front deepened rather than removed the distrust aroused by his previous conduct. "It might have been different," remarks Hoffmann, "had he made his concessions of his own initiative before he had an invasion to fear"; but if at "this crisis he had done much more than he has done to pacify the people, this would only have augmented the evil."

Even yet, however, he hardly knew how forlorn was his condition. The Archbishop of Canterbury had

even hinted—and correctly enough, notwithstanding his inevitable prepossessions—that nothing short of his renunciation of Catholicism would secure him the hearty loyalty of the nation; but this possibility James could not entertain, and having made what he could not but deem enormous concessions, he could not credit that the loyalists of the Church of England would, contrary to their own tenets, countenance any attempt against the sacred person of the lawful sovereign. Almost as soon, therefore, as he had undergone his concession ordeal, his spirits began to rise and his old militant ardour to assert itself. Anticipating the coming combat by sea and by land with a strong professional interest, he displayed great activity in superintending the chief arrangements, and soon came to persuade himself that he would be able to give his adventurous son-in-law a hot reception. On 12th October he wrote to his admiral and old friend, Lord Dartmouth, formerly Colonel Legge, that “the great impatience the Prince of Orange has to come out will make him not lose one moment’s time to put to sea, and may be with more haste than good speed. The Scots and Irish troops are marching as fast as they can to join me. . . . I make no doubt that God will protect me and prosper my affairs both by land and sea.” On the 20th, referring to intelligence that the Prince had come out on Friday, he remarks that what damage they had received by the storms of Saturday he did not yet know, but “if what is said of their coming out with so small a quantity of victuals be true, ’tis near to madness.”

Particulars of the damage were forwarded to James by the Marquis D’Abeville. Though considerable, it did not, as James hoped, greatly delay the expedition. It was also well for the prince that he did not wait for reinforcements to make up his losses, for the weather

suited him to a marvel. What were called the Popish winds died away, and a Protestant or easterly gale swiftly sped the Dutch fleet to its destination, while in the most provoking manner it balked and baffled the English admiral. On the morning of 3rd November a great crowd of vessels "like a mighty forest" was seen off Dover sailing westwards, their passage through the Straits occupying seven hours, from ten till five. Next morning they were sighted off the Isle of Wight, and on the morning of the 5th the custom-house officers reported them off Dartmouth, "standing to the eastward with the wind W.S.W. at a moderate gale." Coming to anchor at Torbay, they the same day began to land their soldiers, the prince himself going on shore.

CHAPTER XVI.

JAMES II. AND VII.—NEMESIS.

THE English fleet, lying to intercept the passage of the Dutch fleet northwards, had, on 3rd November, descried it making for the west, but adverse winds prevented pursuit until next morning. The king was in hopes that his fleet would come up with the enemy, all the more that the *Piscatore di Milano* (a kind of *Old Moore* of the period) had predicted "a naval battle of this date"; but it is very doubtful if in any case a battle would have taken place. Though not fully aware to what pitch the spirit of dissatisfaction among officers and men had mounted, Lord Dartmouth must have known of the almost impossibility of bringing his ships into action against the Dutch. When a council of war was held off Beachy Head, it was "so arranged that the result of it was not to fight if in honour it could be avoided." As it happened, however, the issue was decided by the decrees of the winds. Shortly after the English fleet set sail it was driven by a gale to the Downs; and before, on the 16th, it made another start, the Dutch troops with bag and baggage had long been safely landed; but even so, a severe gale again sprang up which compelled it to put back to Spithead. With somewhat dreary hopefulness the

baffled admiral wrote that his "duty would now be to get ready as soon as possible"; but on the 28th he found "a great alteration in most people's faces since my coming thither, not for want of loyalty in most of your commanders, but the daily impressions they receive makes them stand amazed." What, also, must have been his feelings on receipt of a letter of the 25th from Sir Henry Shere, stating that the king was "almost quite deserted," and suggesting that, to avoid receiving instructions, he should keep his fleet for some days at sea!

On land fortune had begun to turn against James with a celerity which he did not yet realise. In his own eyes his case seemed at first by no means desperate. Vexatious as was the safe landing of the Dutch, there was no immediate sign that he was utterly undone. The memory of the Monmouth fiasco appeared to be exercising a salutary influence on the people of the south-west. On the 9th James wrote to Dartmouth: "By the news I had this morning the prince could not be sooner than last night at Exeter, where the mayor and townspeople have behaved themselves very loyally, as indeed all the country thereabout. The train marches to-morrow. . . . I intend to send my own horse and baggage on Tuesday next, to follow myself by the end of the week, and to leave London well guarded." Still before he left he thought fit to send the young prince to Portsmouth, a proceeding which did not tend to increase the confidence of his followers.

Nor was the position improved by his curt refusal to a petition of a number of peers that he should summon a Parliament for the consideration of the situation. He informed the bishops that they would be better employed in praying for his success, and he told the temporal peers, according to Nottingham, that it would

have been more fitting "for them to have appeared with swords in their hands than a petition." Yet by agreeing to their request he might have embarrassed both the Prince of Orange and those who, in the North and Midlands, were stirring up revolt on the plea of an agitation for a free Parliament; but as Hoffmann comments, "he always has the misfortune to choose the worse of two evils."

However stringent might have been the Parliament's demands, his refusal to summon it was bound to injure him almost fatally with the nation; and just before setting out for the army he received a sufficient token of what was in store for him. News arrived that two regiments of cavalry and one of dragoons under Lord Lumley, son of the Earl of Clarendon, had ridden off to the enemy, and although a little later the dismay this had occasioned was transformed into a kind of exultation by the news that most of the troops had turned back, this was too favourable a version of the incident. It, however, enabled the king to set out in pretty good spirits. On reaching Salisbury he also "learned," says Hoffmann, "with great pleasure that the officers showed a great desire to come into action with the enemy." His sprightly lieutenant-general, Churchill, now suggested that he should favour the regiment at Warminster, under Kirke and Trelawney, with the inspiring influence of his presence. A violent bleeding at the nose prevented him undertaking the journey, and subsequent incidents gave rise to the conjecture that had he gone thither he would have been seized by Churchill and delivered over to the Prince of Orange. Most likely the conjecture is erroneous, and the prince would have been disconcerted rather than gratified by such a *coup de main*; but Churchill may have desired an opportunity to consult with Kirke, and it may have been from lack of the consultation

that Kirke deferred too long to put into execution his resolve to join the prince.

The conduct of James now manifested a peculiar deficiency in the qualities needed in such a crisis. Had he possessed the steady resolution, the cool self-reliance, the personal ascendancy appropriate to the great vocation he had chosen, he might have made the task of the Prince of Orange a much more difficult one than it was; but on news reaching him of the revolts in other parts of the country, he, after a council of war on 24th November, resolved, on the advice of the general, Lord Feversham—who had never been noted for enterprise—to retire to Windsor. Feversham also privately advised him to arrest Churchill. Churchill, who was for fighting, may have intended to desert during the battle. If James had clear proofs of his intended treachery he ought to have arrested him; but Churchill could not but see that James by retiring had cast the die against himself; and resolved not to commit themselves further to a losing cause, he and the Duke of Grafton rode off that same evening to the prince.

The previous overweening self-confidence of James, the narrowness of his outlook, and his complete obsession by his own special aims, gave an almost appalling force to the disappointments that were befalling him. Completely staggered and bewildered, he was succumbing to his apprehensions with an abjectness that was merely pitiable. His dismay at the action of Churchill and Grafton was manifested by the precipitancy of his retirement, and he thus paved the way for further defection. Next day the Prince of Denmark and the Duke of Ormonde, after dining with him at Andover on terms of perfect cordiality, followed the example of Churchill. The defection of the prince—who possessed but small ability and little force of character—called

forth from his father-in-law a burst of contempt rather than regret. "After all," he remarked, "a good trooper would have been a greater loss"; but the loss led to another much more deplorable. On receiving information from her husband that he had joined the Prince of Orange, the Princess Anne escaped from London during the night and joined the rebels in the Midlands. "God help me," said the unhappy king, when on reaching Whitehall he learned the pitiable story, "my own children have forsaken me." And Reresby was told by one of the court ladies that the news had "disordered him in his understanding."

The retribution that had fallen on him was bitterly and ignominiously complete. The army and navy, specially organised with a view to make his will effective, had, whether from his own fault or not, proved of no avail. He had not ventured to trust in the succour of the troops remaining under his nominal command; and if the bulk of his subjects were not irreconcilably estranged from him, his own indecision tended to increase dubiety and apathetic indifference amongst those not directly hostile. His two daughters were more than consenting to his humiliation. Such Protestant nobles as were disposed to stand by him were stipulating for conditions which he would not accept; he had ruined Protestant trust in his good faith; and as Hoffmann remarked, even if an arrangement could now be made by which he should remain King of England, he would be only "the mere shadow of a king."

Obstinate and sanguine as he had been almost to the last, the abrupt transformation in his prospects quite broke his spirit. He had now no fight left in him. He was no longer, and he was never again to be, the man he had been,—the man who, it was remarked, was seen at his best only in the immediate conflict and peril of battle. Though he would not forego his

Catholic purposes, and ever declined to purchase his retention on the throne by any substantial ecclesiastical compromise, his will seemed paralysed by the unexpected blow to his self-sufficiency. Instead of attempting any show of resistance to the enemy's advance, his thoughts became concentrated on securing his personal safety—not we may charitably suppose from mere personal cowardice, for he had in bygone days fearlessly risked his life over and over again in battle, but probably because he deemed the preservation of his life and liberty of prime consequence in the interests of the Catholic cause in Britain. Already he had taken precautions, as he thought, for the escape of his son, and he speedily came to the conclusion that for himself and the queen there was, meanwhile, no choice but exile.

On the day after his arrival at Whitehall he conferred with about forty peers, to whose advice that he should dismiss all Catholics from office and dissociate himself from the policy of France he listened with ill-concealed impatience. He now agreed to summon a Parliament, and next day appointed Halifax, Nottingham, and Godolphin to treat with the prince; but, while Nottingham informs us that they undertook the mission merely at the king's command, and with no hope of success, James himself told Barillon that in both cases he was merely finessing to gain time to send the queen and the Prince of Wales to a place of safety. As early as the 25th he had instructed Lord Dartmouth to follow the directions of Lord Dover in regard to his son. These and other letters sent at the same time did not reach Lord Dartmouth until 3rd December, along with others of the 29th November and 1st December, the last enjoining that immediately on its receipt he should follow the orders given him and Lord Dover for the sending away of the Prince of Wales: that as soon as

wind and weather permitted he should be sent in one of the yachts to the nearest convenient port in France. Lord Dartmouth replied that to remove the prince to a foreign court was treason of "so high a nature" that he hoped his majesty would neither exact it of him nor contemplate the thought of it. This left James no option than to adopt Dartmouth's suggestion that the prince should be sent to London; but he was quite past being moved by Dartmouth's representations. To him he wrote on 10th December: "Things having so very bad a prospect, I could no longer defer securing the queen and my son, which I hope I have done, and that to-morrow by noon they will be out of the reach of my enemies. I am at ease now I have sent them away." But his "ease" was of a limited kind, for he recognised that he was "in no good condition, nay, in as bad a one as is possible": so bad that he had himself determined on immediate flight, and promised the queen to follow her within twenty-four hours.

Early next morning he fled from Whitehall, leaving, under address to Pepys, another letter for Dartmouth, announcing that he had decided to withdraw "till this violent storm is over, which will be in God's good time"; and advising that if any of the fleet were free to continue serving him, they should be sent to Ireland "to follow such orders as they should receive from Lord Tyrconnel." To Dartmouth himself he made no appeal, but added, "And this I may say, never any prince took more care of his sea and land men as (*sic*) I have done, and been so very ill repaid by them." To Feversham he also sent a letter, amounting to a recommendation that he should disband his troops; and this suggestion Feversham adopted in such a reckless fashion as greatly to endanger the lives and property of the community.

Clad in a shabby cloak and black clerical wig, to

enable him to pass as a servant of Sir Edward Hales, James, after passing down the secret stairs, drove in a hackney-coach to the ferry at Milbank. While crossing the river he is supposed to have dropped the Great Seal into the water, where, some months afterwards, it was caught in a fisherman's net and dragged to the surface. In commissioning Rotier to make a new one, James stated, as we learn from a document at Windsor, that he had destroyed the other. The Catholic and Protestant officials who had not already gone now took to flight; and soon thereafter a mob of excited Protestants, reinforced by the rascaldom of the town, began to pull down and spoil the Catholic chapels and religious houses, and then rifled those of the foreign embassies not protected by guards of soldiers. To Dartmouth, a correspondent reports on the 11th December, that the burning appurtenances "at this instant make the sky so very red, that I can see it out of the rooms here at the Post Office."

From the Surrey side of the river James, attended by Sir Edward Hales and others, galloped, with relays of horses, through the winter night to Elmsley Ferry, which was reached at ten in the morning. Here they boarded a custom-house hoy, but as it was not properly ballasted to carry sail they touched at Sheerness, and, while waiting for the tide, were beset by fishermen in three boats engaged in the lucrative pastime of detaining and rifling Catholic fugitives. Sir Edward Hales, clapping fifty guineas into the hand of the leader, when his men were not looking, whispered that he should have a hundred more if he let them safely off. This did harm rather than good: Sir Edward, a notorious Kent Catholic, was well known, and the shabby-cloaked figure was now judged to be a fugitive of special importance, possibly the hated Father Petre. Openly the leader now proposed that they should put their valu-

ables into his hands, "which," says James, "he promised to keep safe, and that if they were found free men they should be restored, and if lawful prize be more equally divided." Secretly he informed Hales that it was his intention to get them off; and with this view the ship was turned towards Faversham, where the leader landed. On his return he told them they must appear before the mayor; and a coach was sent to bring them to the Queen's Arms—now the Ship Hotel. When the king's identity was known he was respectfully treated, but since a reward was expected for his detention, his captors continued to keep watch and ward even after his transference to the mayor's residence. It was beyond James, as his late brother might have done, to take either a tactical or humorous view of his predicament. He was both strongly indignant and exceedingly apprehensive, and his contending emotions led to a recurrence of his attack of bleeding at the nose.

On news of his detention reaching London, the Council of Lords, who had undertaken the provisional government, sent Lord Feversham with a troop of horse-guards for his protection; and the Earl of Ailesbury and other friends hastened down to give him the comfort of their presence. According to Nottingham, Feversham was instructed to protect him, but "not to restrain him in the least from any liberty or any resolution he might be pleased to take." But Feversham and those with him still cherished dreams of his reinstatement, and strongly advised him to return to London. Their extreme friendliness may have helped to dissipate the black cloud of despondency that enveloped him, but in any case he was in a dilemma. His resumption of flight would be awkward and difficult, and in London a more favourable opportunity might present itself for leaving the country.

In a letter from Whitehall to the King of France, he committed his wife and son to his protection, and stated that but for his detention he should have been to ask the same protection for himself; but after setting out for London he had sent Feversham to announce to the Prince of Orange that he was returning to Whitehall, and to invite him, with a view to a conference, to take up his residence in St James's.

Whatever his motives, intentions, or hopes, his decision was a singular one. To make a show of returning in all the pomp and dignity of sovereign state to the palace from which a few days previously he had, at dead of night, fled in ignominious disguise, was in truth preposterous; and his most appropriate welcome would have been shouts of derision. But much bewilderment prevailed, and the loyalty of the Protestant cavaliers was dying very hard. The unique spectacle of the progress in state through his capital of the lately fugitive monarch could not but cause a strange sensation. With most, probably the dominant sentiment was wondering speculation. No insults were offered him: those who did not applaud remained silent; and the loyal, or thoughtless and inconstant, crowd had it all their own way, so that from a considerable proportion of the onlookers he received the customary oblation of cheers. Though the character of his reception contrasted strikingly with the late scenes of wild Anti-Catholic riot, the loyalists probably exaggerated its cordiality. While some tell us that the cheering was but that of comparatively few, Ailesbury affirms that the joy was great and general; and Sir Henry Shere writes to Dartmouth: "The king came through the town last night, and was attended through the streets to Whitehall with great shoals of people and the bells ringing." Hoffmann, while mentioning the "acclamations," also states that there was a

general hope of an amicable settlement; but Barillon, while also noting them, expresses the opinion that at heart the people are for the Prince of Orange.

The prince could hardly be expected to favour proposals to give James another chance. Whether disposed or not to enter into an agreement, while James was still facing him in arms, he was not likely to do so after the Prince of Wales had been transferred to France; and he was still less likely to do so after James had stultified himself by an attempt to escape thither, and on being detained had on second thoughts decided—a mere broken man though he now was—to make a show of resuming his sovereignty. Instead, therefore, of receiving Feversham as a delegate from a lawful sovereign, he placed him under arrest, and he sent his own Dutch soldiers to relieve the guards at Whitehall and St James's; “after all which,” writes Hoffmann, “if the king is not a prisoner, there is no real difference between a prisoner and him.”

But to make James a prisoner was no purpose of the prince; he preferred that he should again be a fugitive, and sent Shrewsbury, Halifax, and Delamere to desire that he should retire to Ham-on-Thames. Without a remonstrance James submitted to expulsion from his palace, merely stating that he preferred to go to Rochester; and whatever his previous hopes, we know from Lord Balcarres—who with Dundee had, on 17th December, accompanied him on his morning walk in the Mall—that he had again decided to go to France. The prince immediately acceded to the Rochester proposal, only adding that he must go at once, and not through the city but by the water to Gravesend. About eleven o'clock he therefore embarked on the royal barge, preceded and followed by a boatful of Dutch soldiers. From Gravesend he journeyed next day to Rochester with a bodyguard of sixty Dutch

cuirassiers. Here he occupied his old house, which had a terraced garden bordering on the river. It was guarded by a detachment of Dutch horse and foot, but the sentries were placed at the fore door towards the street and none at the back door towards the river. This James interpreted as a hint that he was free to resume his interrupted voyage; but the fact that this was the apparent mind of the prince, did not, James tells us, prevent him being of the same mind himself: he was even possessed by an apprehension that if he did not leave the country the prince would "probably find the means of sending him out of it and the world at the same time." No vehement letter from his wife was needed, as Burnet supposes, to make him set out: preparations for escape were renewed as soon as he reached Rochester. Owing to doubt of the prince's attitude they were conducted with the utmost secrecy; and it was at the dead of night of 22nd December that, accompanied by his natural son, the Duke of Berwick, he went on board a small boat, which rowed him to a smack waiting at Sheerness.

The night before he sailed he gave Ailesbury to understand that he had decided to go away, and he wrote mysteriously to Middleton: "I have thought fit to withdraw myself, but must not tell you where I shall be; if honest and loyal men will declare for me and stand by me, I shall soon come to them." He also left a Declaration—mainly a bitter remonstrance against his treatment by the Prince of Orange, and concluding with the expression of a hope that Parliament would "agree to a liberty of conscience to all Protestant dissenters, and those of his own persuasion might have such a share of them as would at least enable them to live peaceably and quietly." "I have seen the paper," Godolphin told the Lords, who met on Monday after his flight, "and I grieve to say

that there is nothing in it to give your lordships satisfaction."

Early on Christmas day James disembarked at Ambleteuse, a small port near Boulogne, and traveling rapidly by post-chaise drawn by three horses, he reached St Germain the day after the arrival of the queen and the Prince of Wales. On learning of his disembarkation the queen had exclaimed, "My God! I am the happiest woman in the world"; and profoundly moved though she must have been by their misfortunes, she retained a cheerful dignity of mien; but it was evident enough that his late ordeal had greatly shattered the spirits of the king. Madame de Sévigné, writing of them when they arrived, described the queen as "tranquil and very pleasing, with a good figure and plenty of spirit"; but has nothing to say of her husband except that he looked old and tired. His strange passivity, the air of listless indifference with which he referred to his misfortunes, was commented on by every one. Later Madame de Sévigné remarks that while the queen has "a great deal of spirit, not so her husband; he has courage but lacks *esprit*, and talks of what has happened to him with an insensibility which inspires insensibility in others." Rizzini, while stating that "the indifference or quasi-insensibility which he manifests is observed with various and different interpretations," is disposed to attribute it to his control over his feelings; but the Abbé Melani, while reporting that he "lives always surrounded by ecclesiastics, and speaks of his disgrace with such indifference as if it did not concern him," affirms that "the French have totally lost conceit of him; and such as knew him when, as Duke of York, he was in Flanders, assert that he is not the same man, so great is the change that they find in his Majesty."

The royal exiles were received by Louis XIV. with

warm and delicate courtesy. St Germain's was assigned them as a residence; and only at their special request was their allowance limited to 50,000 francs a month. But beneath the velvet glove Louis concealed the gauntlet of iron. If not his prisoners, his royal guests were his political tools. An amicable settlement between James and his son-in-law was not what he desired. When, therefore, on her husband's detention at Faversham, the queen thought of rejoining him in England, he instructed Louvois to inform his envoy Berighien, that even if the King of England were to require her return, alone or with the Prince of Wales, to England, his intention was that he should bring them to Vincennes, giving them to understand that his instructions would not permit him to do anything else.

From France James sent to England a letter filled with the old complaints and the old declarations of his desire to protect the professors of the Protestant religion, more especially those of the Church of England; but if such professions did not avail him before, they were not likely to avail him now; and the letter only helped to facilitate the accession of the Prince of Orange. That he had also learned nothing from his misfortunes, is shown by the tenor of his appeals and those of the queen to the European Powers for help. Her energy had galvanised him into activity; and, if largely in a semi-dazed and mechanical fashion, he was still set, obstinately and blindly, on the realisation of none other than his old ideals.

It was also characteristic of him to be deeply offended at the refusal of the emperor to join the hoped-for coalition on his behalf. He was too pre-occupied with his own point of view to recognise that the emperor had also his particular point of view, and that it scarce could be that of France. The emperor's

surprise that he, the special friend of the King of France, should ask assistance of him, while engaged "in repressing an unjust war which the French king has lately brought against us," he could not understand. Convinced that his cause was the one cause of supreme importance, he also sent Colonel Porter on a special mission to the Pope with the suggestion that he "should interpose to bring about peace between Catholic princes," in order that "the very Christian king might be in a position to assist him to retain his kingdoms, and, to say the truth, to save the Catholic religion from being extirpated not merely in my three kingdoms but everywhere else by the Protestant League which the Prince of Orange has formed." To Cardinal d'Este he also expressed the hope that his Holiness will believe that "the occasion which presents itself of destroying heresy with a Catholic army is one which ought not to be lost." His proposal was characteristically chimerical. It involved a course of action bound still more to estrange him from the bulk of his old subjects; while it was vain to hope that the emperor and the Pope, shutting their eyes to the ambitions of Louis XIV., would espouse to the utmost of their power the cause of his special tool.

The only hope left to James was thus Louis XIV., who was inclined to aid him only so as to suit his own ends. A Britain as united and powerful as of yore was not his desire, but rather a Britain perplexed and distracted, and enfeebled, if possible, by the loss of Ireland, which, whether under the Stewarts or not, he wished to be made a fief of France. While mentioning that Ireland would be a convenient basis for an expedition to Scotland, preparatory to an invasion of England from the north, his private opinion was that "the best thing James could do was to forget that he had reigned in Great Britain and concentrate himself on placing

Ireland in good condition and establishing himself there."

James undertook the lesser adventure with reluctance; but however half-heartedly, he set sail from Brest on 7th March 1689, and landing at Kinsale on the 12th, made his state entry into Dublin on the 24th. His inability to recognise the supreme importance of harmonious action between him and the Count d'Avaux—deputed to assist him by his counsel and keep the French king fully informed of the state of affairs—attests his full retention of his old impracticable self-sufficiency. But equally clear is it that he had ceased to be the methodical and punctilious administrator that he once had been, and that he was now beset with a chronic mental and moral flaccidity which quite disabled him from grappling with the arduous task before him.

The first letter of d'Avaux, after the landing at Kinsale, was ominous of coming disaster. "The sole thing," he says, "which gives me pain is the irresolution of the King of England, who often changes his opinion and does not always determine for the best"; and again, a little later, he writes, "I cannot express to you the chagrin I feel at the conduct of the King of England and the resolution I see him take every day." While of opinion that with proper measures Ireland might easily be placed in surety, he affirms that the king is neglecting nearly everything that is essential. Writing Louvois on the 20th May, General de Rosen also affirms that never a day passes that he does not represent to the king the bad state of affairs. Discipline, organisation, provisioning, and the repression of disorders were all neglected; and no energy was shown in the attempts to reduce Londonderry and other places of strength. Already he was proposing to leave Ireland practically to its fate, and join Dundee in Scotland with a reinforcement of Irish troops; and on 13th June he

sent Melfort to Louvois urging that a fleet should be sent to convey him to Scotland or England as "an absolute necessity"; but doubtless de Rosen and Louvois were correct in their opinion that this was the best way to lose the three kingdoms, and the fleet was not sent. Very soon a series of disasters foreshadowed what was in store for him. On 1st August the siege of Londonderry was raised; three days afterwards a strong detachment of royalist Irish was routed by the Enniskilliners at Newton Butler; and on news of this reaching the troops retiring from Londonderry, they fled in disorder to Charlemont. Their retreat caused Sarsfield to abandon Sligo; and shortly afterwards news reached the distracted king that Schomberg had landed in Ireland; while, by the death of Dundee at Killiecrankie, all hope was gone of a Scottish diversion.

This swift transformation of his outlook reduced James to the old condition of apathetic despair; but the greatness of their danger aroused unwonted energy in the Irish commanders. Very soon a force was assembled at Drogheda, to which Schomberg, with an army mainly of raw recruits, deemed it hazardous to give battle. Entrenching himself strongly at Dundalk, he therefore devoted his whole attention during the winter to the training of his troops; and had James been as diligent in this as Schomberg, he would have been better prepared for the coming struggle. But the Abbé Melani affirms that he had lost the confidence of his army, having in Ireland, as he had done in England, made himself "an object of compassion and scorn"; and it is at least certain that he was lacking both in the forethought and inspiring energy that the situation demanded. He was, be it remembered, a well-trained soldier who had learned the art of war under Turenne; but he now seemed to

have forgotten all that he had learned. With proper preparations and tactics he might, aided by the French reinforcements under Lauzun, have met the Prince of Orange—who on 14th June landed at Carrickfergus—with a superior force. As, meanwhile, this could not be done, Lauzun wished, he tells us, to avoid a pitched battle; but a strong position having been found on the banks of the Boyne, James prepared to defend it, and then, too late, changed his mind. The occasion of his disastrous defeat on 1st July was the lack of moral stamina in the Irish infantry, mainly due to neglect of their proper training and discipline; but James himself did nothing to inspire them with courage, to direct the fortunes of the fight, or to stem the tide of defeat. The presence of the prince seemed again to have paralysed him. Watching the progress of the fight at a respectful distance, he never thought of interposing to rally his wavering troops; and as soon as the tide of battle began to go against him, he showed concern for nothing but his own escape. Turning his back on the foe, he rode rapidly, accompanied by his body-guard of cavalry, towards Dublin, which he reached late the same evening.

Despair, so far as Ireland was concerned, had now possession of him. Early in the following morning he called together the mayor and the members of his council, and after a querulous address to the effect that with such faint-hearted soldiers it was impossible to carry on the contest with success, he advised that “the citizens should make the best terms they could” with his conqueror, and immediately set out for Waterford. Entering a French ship he set sail to join certain French frigates at Kinsale, and landing at Brest, he, on 25th July, reached St Germain, to the astonishment, says Madame de Sévigné, of all Versailles and Paris.

Oblivious of his awkward desertion of his post, and

the French troops sent by Louis to his assistance, he now pressed upon Louis the necessity of a descent on England before William could return thither; and he felt deeply hurt when Louis displayed no readiness to commit himself to so stupendous an undertaking. "No one," laments the queen to Lauzun, "believes a word we say, nor will listen to our proposals for a descent into England before the Prince of Orange returns thither, or for sending ships into St George's Channel, which is the most necessary thing in the world."

Notwithstanding the almost insuperable difficulty of the Catholicism of James, and his inability to discontinue his imprudent policy for its furtherance, there were not a few persons of influence in England, including those offended by the new king's favour for his own Dutch compatriots, who were disposed to give him another trial. Encouraged by communications from Marlborough, a quarrel between the Princess Anne and her sister, and the belief that the discontented English Admiral, Edward Russell, would contrive not to interfere with the French fleet, the hopes of James became so exceedingly sanguine that he again pressed upon Louis a scheme for an English invasion; and Louis so far credited his representations as to deem it possible that an expedition might seriously embarrass his great enemy. Rizzini, while deeming it "an arduous enterprise," still thought it might succeed; and at any rate, "if a landing was effected, a civil war might be lit up which would ensure the most useful consequences to France in diverting Orange's forces," &c. Since, therefore, James could supply 14,000 Irish troops, which had landed at Brest in December and been formed into regiments, Louis agreed to reinforce them with 10,000 French soldiers, and grant them the convoy of the French fleet.

The Declaration by which James heralded the expedi-

dition could hardly be reckoned by his friends in England so discreet and conciliatory as he intended it to be. While decreeing vengeance against all serious offenders, including even the fishermen who had detained him at Faversham, to those now rendering eminent services, he promised besides an immediate pardon under the Great Seal, special rewards as the merits of their case suggested; while those who remained neutral would be provided for by a general indemnity. But since he thought fit to affirm that he had nothing to repent of in his previous conduct, it was hard to see how he was to gain the goodwill which his previous conduct had lost him; and, in fact, the Government deemed that they could not do better than give so injudicious a document as wide a circulation as possible. Its effect, good or bad, was, however, to matter little. While he was embarking his men in the transports at La Hogue, the French fleet under Tourville, which ventured to give battle to the allied fleet under Russell, suffered disastrous defeat, thirteen ships, which fled to La Hogue, being burned in sight of the mortified ex-monarch and his legions. Such a sudden and hopeless ending to his glorious anticipations overwhelmed him with despair. "I entreat you," he wrote to Louis, "to interest yourself no more in one so unfortunate, but permit me to withdraw with my family to some corner of the world where I may cease to be an interrupter to your Majesty's wonted course of prosperity and glory."

Yet he was as assured as ever both of the justice and greatness of his cause and his own high deserts. He had been strangely and unaccountably unfortunate; but his aims, in his own opinion, were the very best; and he would admit no fault or foolishness in the means by which he had sought to accomplish them. His friends could hardly induce him even to pretend to vary

his tactics. In the end he signed a document which tended to convey the impression that he would strictly regulate his conduct by the letter of the law and cease to insist on the suspension of the Test Act; but he signed it with the utmost reluctance, and from Melfort's representations to the Pope it is clear that he intended practically to ignore it as soon as he returned to Whitehall.

In accordance with this ostensibly new policy of James, Louis XIV. sent in December to the English Jacobites a letter affirming his desire to restore the King of England by the means most conformable to the interests and spirit of the nation, and to the fundamental constitution of the government. These professions were intended to prepare the way for the creation of a great conspiracy on his behalf, so that in England a formidable force might be organised to co-operate with a reinforcement of troops from France. The negotiations were continued, without definite result, until the death of Queen Mary of England in December 1694. Towards the close of 1695 the Duke of Berwick was sent over to negotiate with the leading Jacobites; Sir John Fenwick was named lieutenant-general of the hoped-for troops; and Sir George Barclay obtained from James a commission, "requiring our loving subjects to rise in arms and make war on the Prince of Orange the usurper of our throne." This commission Barclay made use of to arrange a plot for the assassination of King William. The Duke of Berwick did not think himself "bound in honour" to dissuade Barclay from his purpose; but lest he should be compromised, returned to France. Whether James had any inkling of it or not, Sir John Fenwick also was privy to it, and it was intended that the rising should follow the assassination. But since it failed no signal reached the French fleet, which for weeks lay

waiting for it; and the abortive conspiracy was the last of the efforts—all curiously ill-guided—of James to regain his throne.

At the beginning of negotiations for peace with France in 1696, William suggested the recognition as his successor of him whom he now admitted to be the son of James II.; and the proposal was approved by Louis, who, when the Peace of Ryswick was about to be signed in 1697, mooted it to James II. in the presence of Queen Mary; but the queen passionately declared that she would rather see her son dead than that he should be the medium of doing such wrong to his father, and in a colder fashion James himself declared that he would not tolerate that his son should be a party to such injustice to himself. William then strove to make it a condition of peace that the royal exiles should leave St Germain's. This Louis refused, and since James remained in France, the allowance of £50,000 a-year, which was her jointure, was withheld from Mary of Modena; and nothing was paid her even after the death of her husband.

With the extinction of his royal hopes, the interest of James in life died out. While retaining some of his old zest for hunting, he continued his recreations mainly from courtesy and consideration for others. Strangers noted that "he was very much decayed, and always seemed to force a smile." A hopeless gloom began to envelop the court of St Germain's, which was described "as the dolefullest place in France next to the Bastille." Believing that his calamity was due to the displeasure of heaven at his previous moral irregularities, he became absorbed in austerities and devotions, and systematically chastised himself by the rigorous observation of the mortifications and penances practised by Catholic devotees. The great religious solemnities he attended with fervent punctiliousness;

and at stated periods he retreated to the monastery of La Trappe, where he adopted the mode of life practised by that austere community.

Succeeding a life of rather free indulgence in pleasure, his sorrows and severities gradually broke down his originally strong constitution. A tumour, for which he was operated on in 1694, seriously affected his health, though he was able again to resume his accustomed round of observances and engagements; but while at mass, 4th March 1701, in the Chapel of St Germain's, at the passage, "Our inheritance is turned to strangers, our houses to aliens," a sense of calamitous desolation so overcame him that he fell forward in a faint. A recurrence of his old attack of bleeding at the nose probably saved his life; but one side of his body was found to be paralysed. Sent to recruit at the waters of Bourbon, he returned in June but little improved in health, and quite unable to attend to the usual routine of business. A second seizure occurred in July; and a third, on 2nd September, when he was attending mass, was succeeded by an effusion of blood which fatally weakened him. From Louis he had the assurance that he would recognise the Prince of Wales as King of England, Scotland, and Ireland; but he was unable to express his gratitude except by a look of joy and a faint pressure of the hand. He died at three o'clock of 6th September.

James had requested that his body should be buried in the Church of St Germain's without any ceremony, like the poor, and with the simple epitaph: "Here lies James II. King of England"; but his widow and her advisers decided on other and more elaborate obsequies. After embalmment, the body was brought to the convent of the English Benedictines in the Rue St Jaques, the heart being, on the way thither, deposited in the Convent of the Visitation at Chaillot, beside that of his

mother. His brain, bequeathed to the Scots College in Paris, was preserved in the chapel there, in a gilt brazen urn, until the Revolution, when it disappeared; and its identification with the contents of one of two small leaden vessels, discovered in 1883 beneath the floor boards, cannot be said to have been made out. The entrails were bequeathed to the English College at St Omer, and the præcordia was placed in the Parish Church of St Germain. The body in a wooden coffin, enclosed in a leaden one surrounded by a wooden sarcophagy, was placed in a small chapel of the Benedictines, in the hope that it would yet be brought to Westminster Abbey. The coffin of his daughter Louisa was placed beside it, both coffins being constantly visited by loyalist pilgrims until the Revolution. The coffin of Queen Mary, who died on 7th May 1718, was deposited in the Convent of the Visitation at Chaillot. At the Revolution the coffin of James was broken up by the *sans-culottes* to obtain lead for bullets. An Irishman who witnessed the outrage, affirms that the body was in a condition of perfect preservation. It was carried away by the *sans-culottes*, and is supposed to have been thrown into the *fosse commune*.

The one notably commendable characteristic of James II. was his staunchness to his convictions; and, consequent on this, the one striking characteristic of his reign was the swiftness with which he unwittingly demolished the sovereign ascendancy which his brother had won. But for his Catholicism and the rash imprudence of his efforts for its propagation, he might have retained this ascendancy even though he lacked the tact and personal popularity of his brother, and though his mental narrowness was aggravated by his military training, which tended to confer on his absolutism a hard and unbending character, and to make him demand from his officials a

submission of the will and judgment even as regards their beliefs, corresponding to the military discipline of an army. While he and his brother were equally set on resisting encroachments on the sovereign's prerogatives, his conscientious devotion to the interests of his faith was more commendable than his brother's consummate worldliness; but, on the other hand, while his brother was a master in opportunism, he, on the contrary, proved to be fatuously impracticable. If his resolve to set at naught the prevailing Protestant sentiment of the country showed at least magnificent self-confidence, it was not statesmanship; and, moreover, the repute he might have earned by risking not merely his throne but his life on behalf of his convictions, was lost by an apparent, if only apparent, pusillanimity when brought face to face with the threatening dangers he had created. Here he contrasts very much to his disadvantage with his father, who, if on various critical occasions he showed a peculiar lack of decision, manifested in his final struggle with his adversaries a vigorous pertinacity, and, when at last no prospect but execution was before him, a calm heroism, which won for his memory a respect that contributed not a little to bring about the Restoration. In addition to this, the ecclesiastical aims of James were more opposed than those of his father to the general beliefs or prejudices of the nation; and the fact that he seemed to represent the final development of the aims of the Stewart sovereigns, has tended unfairly to prejudice the case of his Stewart predecessors, and to involve them in an undeserved disrepute. Apart from him—and even to some extent in his case also, for even yet ecclesiastical antipathies are apt to cloud the judgment—it may be said that in pronouncing on the character and aims of the Stewart sovereigns, too little regard

is often paid to the peculiarities of their times and circumstances; and especially as regards the later Stewarts, while the various salutary influences of their reigns are forgotten, there is a tendency to make present-day opinions the criterions of their conduct. This is worse than vain. Their perspective had necessarily its own special limits just as ours has. They could not be wise and tolerant and constitutional in the fashion derived from the teachings of a later experience than theirs; no more than can the statesmen of our time attain to the political wisdom, the noble tolerance, and the governmental efficiency which it is to be hoped will be more and more the heritage of future generations.

Then, if we can find comparatively little in the reigns of the Stewarts for approbation or eulogy, can we in the Parliaments of the seventeenth century discover much more worthy of unmingled commendation? Did the Parliament, and more especially did the House of Commons, really cut a better figure in the mingled warfare of politics and religion than did the sovereigns? Would it not be more than rash to claim for the Parliament in any reign a monopoly of such political wisdom as was then possible? Did it prove itself to be less actuated than the sovereigns by sectarianism and intolerance, less disposed towards persecution, more enlightened in its views of social and religious liberty, or more devoted to the furtherance of the nation's true prosperity, and of political and ecclesiastical content? Was, in short, the real seat of the evil not in the internal discord of the nation—the discord which was the birth-throes of a new political and ecclesiastical era, a discord that could not immediately be healed either by the Parliament or the sovereigns, but only gradually dispelled through the slow processes of experience and the wisdom gained

by failure and suffering! It was the peculiar misfortune of the Stewarts that their sovereignties in Britain were coincident with the period when the ecclesiastical and constitutional conflict was at its bitterest. That being so, they are often credited with its sole creation, whereas it was previously in a process of inevitable development which made them more or less its victims.

Of the eight children of James by Anne Hyde only two daughters survived childhood: Mary, who married the Prince of Orange and with him succeeded to the throne as joint sovereign after the expulsion of her father; and Anne, who married Prince George of Denmark, and succeeded to the sovereignty on the death of the Prince of Orange. By Mary of Modena he had seven children, of whom only James Francis Edward (according to the legitimate succession, James III. and VIII.) and Louisa Maria (who died of smallpox in 1712) survived him. Of his illegitimate children he had by Arabella Churchill, James Fitz-James (1670-1734), Duke of Berwick, Marshal of France, Duc de Fitz-James in France, and Duke of Liria and Xercia in Spain; Henry Fitz-James (1673-1702), created Duke of Albemarle in 1696, Grand Prior of France; Henrietta (1670-1730), married to Sir Henry Waldegrave of Cheriton, afterwards Lord Galmoye, on account of which she had a quarrel with her parents and retired to Flanders; and Arabella (1672-1762), who became a nun. By Catherine Sedley he, or Lord Preston, was the father of Catherine Darnley, married first to James third Earl of Anglesey, and after divorce from him to John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham. A spinster lady, Jane Stuart (1654-1742), who was employed at the court of James in England, and is interred in the Quaker burial-ground at Wisbech, declared herself to be his daughter.

CHAPTER XVII.

JAMES FRANCIS EDWARD.

WITHIN six months of the birth of James Francis Edward, 10th June 1688, his mother fled with him to France. In the darkness of the blustering and rainy night of 9th December, she stealthily left Whitehall, carrying with her what was still fondly deemed the heaven-sent pledge of a future Catholic dynasty for Britain; and crossing the river at Horse Ferry, journeyed by coach and six to Gravesend, whence a yacht brought them after a stormy passage to Calais. The funereal gloom which gradually settled on the exiled court tended to develop in the boy a certain apathetic gravity; and his mental outlook was also straitened by the immense care taken to secure that he should become a model Catholic prince. He was, however, benefited by a good secular education. He became proficient in Italian as well as in French and German, and possessing mild literary proclivities, he could express his placid sentiments and opinions with a certain felicitous propriety. In a limited fashion prudent and sensible, he was, on the other hand, defective in ardour and daring, though, like his father and grandfather, immovably devoted to certain cherished convictions.

His temperament and his convictions alike dis-

qualified him for success in the stupendous task his father had bequeathed him. They placed him in an almost hopeless quandary. If he ever had a chance of the throne, it was when King William in 1697 proposed to adopt him as his successor, provided he were educated in England as a Protestant. When his father and mother rejected this offer with scorn, the Duke of Gloucester, son of the Princess Anne, was still alive. His death on 2nd July 1700 gave a considerable fillip to the Jacobite hopes, which were not greatly discouraged by the Act of Settlement of 12th June 1701, which placed the Electress Sophia in the succession. Again, the death of James II. in the following September was rather an advantage to the Jacobites, for his pragmatism had no longer to be considered.

The promise of Louis to James II. on his deathbed to acknowledge his son as King of Great Britain diffused a glow of happiness on the exiled king's expiring hours; but the proclamation of the sovereignty of James Francis Edward at the Palace Gate of St Germain on the 18th September merely led to special precautions against his succession. A Bill was introduced for his attainder, and to the Act King William gave his assent on 7th March 1701-2, the day before his death. Nevertheless the accession of the boy's now childless half-sister Anne could not be deemed quite unfavourable to his future prospects. Even if the dying message of her father, as communicated by his widow, awoke no sentiments of compunction for her past or present conduct, she might well be supposed more favourable to the claims of her half-brother as her successor than those of a distant relative. Events were, however, by no means favourable to an immediately friendly understanding. Shortly after her coronation, 4th May 1702, war was declared

against France; and the Jacobites inevitably returned to the old methods of plot and conspiracy. An Act of Security, passed by the Scottish Parliament in 1703, still further complicated the situation. While providing that the Scottish successor should be of the royal line and of the Protestant faith, it declared the same person to be incapable of sovereignty in both countries, unless Scotland were granted the concession of "a free communication of trade, the freedom of navigation, and the liberty of the plantations"; and on 3rd August 1704, the queen, owing to the effects of the sham Jacobite plot manufactured by Lord Lovat, gave her assent to the Act, substantially as originally passed. Were Scotland again to have had a different sovereign from England, the probable choice would have been the Duke of Hamilton, the next heir to the Scottish crown after the descendants of James VI.; but a recurrence to a separation of the crowns was a mere day-dream. Yet the Act of Security tended to create a dangerous situation; and as a safeguard, negotiations for the union of the two kingdoms were pressed upon the Scottish Parliament, which by the aid of various unscrupulous expedients led to the ratification of a Treaty of Union 16th January 1707.

By the Union many Scots deemed that the nation had again, as under Cromwell, been robbed of its independence; and the Union's sentimental unpopularity was augmented by certain practical grievances. So acute became the general discontent that it seemed to the Jacobites to have created a golden opportunity for the success of their cause. As in the time of Charles II., Scotland was therefore chosen as the rallying-ground of the exiled dynasty. The crux, however, of the situation was, as before, the religious difficulty, and unlike his uncle, the new candidate for the nation's suffrages was prepared to do nothing to meet it.

Scotland no longer stipulated for a covenanted king,—that phase of her ecclesiasticism had vanished; but most of the Scots were as Anti-Catholic as ever; and England, on the whole, was as staunchly Protestant as Scotland. The reports of the Jacobite agent, Nathaniel Hooke, and the statements of Lockhart of Carnwath, not to mention those of Ker of Kersland and others, were much too roseate in their hue; and a distinction had also to be drawn between strong Jacobite sentiments and a readiness to face all the perils of rebellion. Even the extreme Jacobite gentry—who alone were enthusiastic—stipulated that before they took up arms the royal exile should appear amongst them; and since it was deemed unwise for him to venture his person in Scotland until they had taken up arms, Louis XIV. engaged in 1708 to supply him with 4000 French troops, to whose support the Scottish Jacobites were to rally as soon as they landed.

Like so many French expeditions, past and to come, this one was rendered abortive by the watchfulness of the English fleet, which made the proposed landing near Edinburgh an impossibility. Just before finally embarking, the young adventurer wrote to his mother: “I hope not to write to you again until I write from the Palace of Holyrood”; but this he was never to do. He was permitted no more than a prospect of the promised land. He was indulged with merely a distant glimpse of the city nestled amongst its picturesque heights; and although he did, a few years afterwards, set foot on Scottish soil, even the fallacious and fleeting success of his son was not to be granted him,—he was never to date a letter from the ancient palace of his forefathers. Some have surmised that Louis had no intention that the expedition should land; but how could he possibly wish to place his men and ships in the deadly peril of immediate pursuit by a stronger

fleet? And but for the rapid approach of the English fleet the expedition would have landed. As it was, the French fleet barely escaped destruction. Foiled in its original purpose, there was some talk of adopting the desperate device of landing at Inverness. But the prudence of the French admiral, Fourbin, or the winds of heaven prevailed against the experiment; and if James also prayed to be set ashore in Fife, this was wisely vetoed: it was decided that the best that could now be hoped for was a safe return to Dunkirk; and since Byng, with the English fleet, was still lying up the Forth, keeping watch and ward over Edinburgh, this within a fortnight was safely accomplished, the only mishaps to the expedition being the capture of one ship and the foundering of another.

James now joined the French army in Flanders, whence glowing accounts of his valour were put in circulation, though they did not imply that it surpassed what was generally expected of a soldier. More may also have been made of the dangers to which he exposed himself than the facts quite justified; for the accounts of Charles Booth, his groom of the bedchamber, to Middleton, of the campaign of 1710, show that whatever may previously have been the case, special precautions were then taken that he should fight merely "as one of his consequence ought to do." But, at any rate, though seriously handicapped by uncertain health, he stuck conscientiously to his military engagements; and it would also appear that he even caused concern to his mother by occasional unrestrained indulgences, like other officers, in the merry-makings of the camp.

The despicable ending of the expedition of 1708 so damped the spirits of the Jacobites that revolutionary attempts became suspended during the lifetime of Queen Anne, efforts being, instead, concentrated on securing her influence and that of the Tory leaders against the

Hanoverian succession. On 2nd May 1711, James even addressed a letter to her, in which he wrote: "I am satisfied, madam, that if you will be guided by your own inclinations, you will readily comply with so just and fair a proposal as to prefer your own brother, the last male of our race, to the Duchess of Hanover." Declaring also that it was "his unalterable resolution to secure and maintain those of the Church of England in all their just rights and privileges as by law established," he proposed that she should send one to him or permit him to send one to her, by which things could be adjusted to their mutual satisfaction. Though she could hardly respond directly to his overtures, information seems to have reached him of her favourable inclinations. During the irritation caused by the attempt of 1708, she had referred to him as a "Popish Pretender"; but whatever her later sentiments towards him, she seems to have discerned the advisability of securing freedom from Jacobite attempts against herself, by doing nothing further to aid or countenance the Hanoverian succession.

The appointment in 1712 of the Duke of Hamilton as ambassador to France was rumoured to be part of a scheme to bring James to Scotland, that he might remain there until the death of Queen Anne: another speculative version was that he was to be brought disguised to London, when Anne would recognise him as her heir. That such fantastic purposes could commend themselves either to Anne, James, the Duke, or the Tory ministers, is hard to credit; and if either attempt was set aside only by Hamilton's treacherous murder in the duel with Lord Mahon, it was well for James that no such bedlamite intention was put to the test.

The Treaty of Utrecht, 11th April 1713, having compelled the removal of the royal exile from French

territory, he, with the cordial assent of the Duc de Lorraine, took up his residence at Bar-le-duc as the Chevalier de St George. Ostensibly hostile as the treaty might be to him, it brought England into closer relations with France. Further, Oxford, Bolingbroke, and other Tory statesmen were, for party purposes, coquetting with the Jacobites; and circumstances might induce them to go much further than they might originally contemplate. From a party point of view, they could not look forward to the Hanoverian succession with much content; and in the nation generally the mere thought of having recourse to a small German electorate for a sovereign was bound to create a certain reaction in favour of the legitimate heir. The question was how far would that reaction go? Would it become so strong and to such an extent national as to make the Hanoverian succession an impossibility, or render probable a subsequent revolt?

But for his Catholicism the succession of James would have been welcomed by the bulk of the nation; but his Catholicism was an almost insuperable obstacle, Bolingbroke being convinced that the people "would more readily accept a Turk than a Catholic." Efforts were therefore now directed towards the removal or diminution of this great stumbling-block. An attempt was made to induce him either to change his religion or to allow hopes to be entertained of this possibility; and he went so far as to take with him to Bar-le-duc only Protestant servants, for whose use a private chapel was fitted up in the castle, of which he appointed the non-juror, Charles Leslie, chaplain. In a letter to a member of Parliament, written for publication, Leslie stated that James had given all the demonstration of his regard for the Protestants, "except parting with his conscience or his honour"; that though "he frequented the public devotions," there "is no sort of bigotry about

him," and that he knew "well the difference between the office of a king and a missionary," and "will concern himself with no man's religion, but is resolved to defend that which is legally established." Though the letter gave no countenance to the idea that he would dissemble his religion, it conveyed an impression that his Catholicism sat somewhat lightly upon him, which was very far from being the case. Meantime the British Parliament indicated its opinion of his claims by both houses issuing a proclamation against him, £5000 being put on his head.

Fruitless negotiations were about this time carried on for his marriage to one of the Archduchesses of Austria. Meanwhile, did he, in his isolation and his difficulties in securing a bride, find solace in the amatory diversions customary with the princes of the period? Against the troubles and afflictions of such indiscretions he had been solemnly warned in a set dissertation, by his too late repentant father, elaborately illustrated by his own distressful experiences and the embarrassments of Charles II. Still, among his associates, such connections were an indispensable fashion; and there are also more than indications that he inherited his father's amatory tendencies. For some time he cherished a strong passion for a certain Mademoiselle de C——, who was not deemed a sufficiently eligible match for him. There is also a definite enough, though merely incidental, allusion by a spy to a mistress he had at Luneville, the authority for the allusion being the circumstantial statement of Floyd or Lloyd, his groom of the chamber. The character of the allusion indicates that such a connection was deemed a mere matter of course, to which no importance was attached. Then there is a very circumstantial tradition about a certain bower at Bar, which it is hard to account for,

had the royal exile notoriously kept himself aloof from such entanglements.

On hearing of the death of Queen Anne, 1st August 1714, James is said to have exclaimed, "I am lost"; but it is far from certain that he would have been saved by the prolongation of her life. The Jacobite movement on his behalf was not making the definite progress that he dreamed. "All," to use the words of Bolingbroke, "was loose and abandoned to the deposition of fortune." George I. was thus more than a year in England before any attempt was made to dispute the possession of the throne; and when it was made it was made with such a lack of definite preparation and concerted action as to preclude even the smallest possibility of success. One important cause of failure was the absence of commanding influence and organising discernment and energy in James himself. He was not the man "to lead armaments of war" or direct the counsels of a great national upheaval. Then, like his father, he was completely mastered by his Catholicism. His main chance was from the Tory discontent with the Hanoverian rule; but the bulk of the Tory party were zealous Protestants and the special champions of the Church of England. Bolingbroke—who, when his political fortunes were wrecked by the Hanoverian succession and even his life seemed to be unsafe, fled to France—was desirous, for his own sake, to do the best he could to effect a Jacobite restoration. It would seem also that the accounts of Leslie and others had made him sanguine that James held his Catholic convictions so lightly that they would not seriously interfere with his prospects of success; but evidently he was greatly taken aback by his first interview with him. His conversation with him, he tells us, answered in no degree to his expectation, and already he began

to repent, if not to be fully persuaded, of his own rashness in connecting himself with his cause. Though Bolingbroke wrote his singular *Letter to Windham*, after his dismissal by James and with a view to discredit him, we must suppose that it expresses his honest, if unvarnished and partly one-sided, opinion of him. Himself the reverse of an ecclesiastic, the rigid ecclesiasticism of James must have filled him with something little short of dismay. But having, meanwhile, little other political option, he accepted from him the seals of the Secretary of State, in the hope of still being able to mitigate his Catholicism or its evils, and sought to do his utmost to give strength and coherence to the movement on his behalf. Disappointment, however, met him in an attempt to prepare a popular memorial for distribution in England. Every phrase was altered or deleted by James which might seem to recognise the possibility of piety or religion outside the Catholic Church. Even such a harmless formality as "blessed" applied to the memory of Queen Anne was inhibited; nor would he allow her the possession of "exemplary piety," nor admit that the Almighty when she died "took her to Himself"; he would commit himself to nothing more than that "she had an inclination to justice," and that the Almighty "put a period to her life." He would not even grant that Charles I. was "a blessed martyr," or even that he "died for his people"; he merely "fell a sacrifice to rebellion." He declined to conciliate the universities by terming them "nurseries of religion"; he would afford them nothing more than the bare and obvious appellation of "nurseries of learning." While acknowledging a certain kind of interest in the Church of England, he declined to recognise the Church of Ireland; and instead of being "solicitous for the prosperity of the Church of England," he refused to be more than "solicitous for the Church of England,"

which, whatever it might mean, was hardly fitted to secure him the enthusiastic devotion of its supporters.

Quite unaware of his nullification of the possible good effect of the document, he innocently remarked to Bolingbroke that it would "not be less popular" for having his name at the bottom of it; but Bolingbroke evaded so stultifying himself, and refers to the alterations "as one continued instance of the grossest bigotry." "His religion," he further wrote, "is not founded on the love of virtue and the detestation of vice, or a sense of the obedience which is due to the will of the Supreme Being, and a sense of those obligations which creatures formed to have a mutual dependence on one another are under. The spring of his whole conduct is fear: fear of the horns of the devil and the pains of hell. . . . He has all the superstition of a Capuchin, but I found in him no tincture of the religion of a prince."

Had he trusted more to the guidance of Bolingbroke, James, without parting with his Catholicism, might at least have cut a better figure than he did; but though he made him his secretary he consulted him only spasmodically, and often acted at cross-purposes with him. Apart from Bolingbroke he did not lack counsellors, but few of them were wise, and he allowed himself to be distracted and confused by their various opinions and plans. The movement on his behalf was thus greatly deficient in unity, cohesion, and organisation. He also took a fatal step in surreptitiously sanctioning the premature rising in the Highlands of Scotland under Mar, which proved a mere *ignus fatuus*, dooming the whole conspiracy to inevitable failure. The death of Louis XIV. on 1st September 1715, while Mar was preparing to set up his standard at Braemar, virtually debarred the immediate possibility of foreign help. Thus, as Bolingbroke remarked, things "had put

on a worse aspect" just when the conspirators were committed to action. The hoped-for French troops were flatly refused; the reception of the money promised before the king's death became very dubious; and the Duke of Berwick, whose military services James had always too sanguinely counted on, now definitely declined to spoil his own career by committing his fortunes to the keeping of his brother. James being nevertheless anxious "to attempt the getting into Britain," Bolingbroke thought that if "the rising in the Highlands be true," he should go to Scotland; but "that wherever he goes, the rising must be general in all parts of the island, so as to distract the forces of the enemy, or he can hope for no tolerable success." There were, however, no signs of its becoming general. Ormonde, who had undertaken the management of the Jacobite movement in England, had come to France, and though so favourable reports reached him from Devonshire that towards the end of October he set sail for Plymouth, the conspiracy there was so completely frustrated by the treachery of Colonel Maclean that he did not venture even to land.

James, eager to be doing something, though, as Bolingbroke remarked, he did not know very well what, had previously arrived at Paris, whence after some hairbreadth escapes he had succeeded in reaching St Malo. On learning of the Devonshire fiasco, he decided to go to Scotland, Ormonde again setting sail, but for Cornwall—not, as James advised, for Lancashire. Finding the west route for Scotland impracticable, James now travelled, as a common sailor, to Dunkirk; and embarking with a few friends on a small privateer vessel, he landed on 22nd December at Peterhead. Thence he wrote to Bolingbroke: "I am at last, thank God, in my ancient kingdom." But he was not to be there long. His presence in Scotland did not

in the least better the situation, which he was soon to persuade himself had become desperate.

Passing through Aberdeen in disguise, he on the 24th reached Fetteresso, a seat of the Earl Marischal, where, being joined by Mar and other gentlemen from Perth, he constituted a Privy Council, which sent out proclamations in the name of James VIII. of Scotland and III. of England, and announced his forthcoming coronation at Scone on 23rd January. From Fetteresso he also sent a letter to the Duke of Gordon announcing his arrival in Scotland, and exhorting him, in conjunction with the Earl of Seaforth, to set about the reduction of Inverness and then join him as speedily as possible at Perth; but this the Duke, whose zeal for the cause had apparently evaporated on 13th November at Sheriffmuir, made no effort to do. Sheriffmuir had been a somewhat different affair from the glowing version of it which had reached France. If a partial Jacobite victory, it was still more a Jacobite frustration, for its effect had been to check the Jacobite advance towards Edinburgh. Simultaneously with it had also occurred the calamity at Preston, where a detachment of Mar's forces, joined by accessions from the Scottish lowlands and the north of England, had been overwhelmed and the principal leaders taken prisoners. This had paralysed the Jacobite cause in the Scottish lowlands and the north of England, and any immediate retrieval of the misfortune had become an almost impossibility.

On 2nd January 1716 James, having been detained at Fetteresso by illness, resumed his journey southwards by Brechin, Glamis, and Dundee—where he remained an hour in the market-place to afford the people an opportunity of kissing his hand—to Scone. Here he took up his residence in the palace. For his coronation at this ancient enthronement-place of his

ancestors, devoted Jacobite ladies improvised a crown from their own jewels and ornaments; but, alas! not even what would have been a very maimed and make-belief ceremony was to take place; there is at least no record of it; and on the very day fixed for it resolution was taken to abandon Perth.

On the day after his arrival at Scone James went to Perth to hold a review of his soldiers, but that he had now been disillusioned of his fond hopes, was only too manifest in his countenance and bearing. Allowance must be made for the strain of his long ordeal of solicitude, and for the mere physical effects of the sudden dissipation of his sanguine day-dreams; but evidently he was incapable of appearing to advantage in a critical and perilous situation. We need not doubt that in his intercourse with Fénelon in 1709, he displayed the social "firmness, equability, self-possession, tact, sweetness and gentleness," attributed to him. In the eyes of Fénelon he seemed to be a model Catholic prince, for he had been carefully trained in conduct, deportment, and demeanour; but Fénelon saw none of his qualities put to a severe test; and though James might have made even a better Cardinal than his son Henry, he possessed neither the temperament nor faculties needed to conduct himself creditably in the desperate emergency that now confronted him. When he showed himself to his soldiers his bearing and expression manifested nothing of the firm sprightliness expected in a military leader. "We found ourselves," says one of them, "not at all animated by his presence, and if he was disappointed in us, we were tenfold more with him. We saw nothing in him that looked like spirit. He never appeared with cheerfulness and vigour to animate us. Our men began to despise him; some asked if he could speak." Another reporter, otherwise in various respects well-informed, narrates that "he

never laughs till he is drunk,"—which may mean merely that his melancholy was chased away only after he had well dined. There is no other reference to his having been overcome by liquor in Scotland, but he would not be averse to share in the champagne which Mar deemed an indispensable aid to generalship,—for he himself, with a rather strained and misplaced affectation of gaiety, wrote to an absent friend, on reaching Boulogne after his flight from Scotland, that with Mar he had been drinking his health in Burgundy.

The perturbation of James was due to the knowledge that Argyll had been reinforced by 6000 Dutch troops under General Cadogan. Mar's deferred forward movement had thus become an impossibility. He had been hampered by the lack of supplies of arms and ammunition from France, but then he ought to have been certain that they were on their way before he set up his standard. Like the weak man he was, he now in his desperation had recourse to the violent device of devastating the country in the line of Argyll's march on the uplands from Dunblane. Had there been a likelihood that by doing so he would have delayed the advance sufficiently long to have enabled him to be in a better condition, by supplies or additional recruits, to resist it, the cruel expedient might have been excused; but he was not guided by any such definite calculation, and, indeed, the extent of country devastated could not, and did not, put Argyll to much inconvenience. Mar affirms that the devastation was done "mightily against the king's mind"; but this only worsens Mar's case without bettering that of James. Though also the well-meaning James sent money to Argyll for distribution amongst the stricken people whom he was pleased to regard as his subjects, it came too late to avert the consequences of their terrible ordeal of hunger and cold.

Though the clans were clamorous to fight, the chances were against a successful resistance at Perth; but had some kind of stand been made there or in some stronger position, the exit of James from Scotland might have been at least robbed of its complete ingloriousness. If his motives were of the very best, his methods left them open to serious misunderstanding. When it was known that, notwithstanding the devastation, Argyll was nearing the city, a rapid retirement was made by the Carse of Gowrie and Dundee to Montrose. The hope of Mar was, he states, that Argyll would be content with occupying Perth and thus give him what he calls "some breathing time"; but this he did not get; and as it happened—though probably not by a merely lucky accident on which Mar had not calculated—a French ship was lying near Montrose. During the night, therefore, of 5th February, while preparations were being made for a continuance of the retreat northwards, James and Mar skulked by a back way to a boat which carried James from his ancient kingdom to the French ship. Mar states that he "advised the king to tell the chiefs of his intention," but that General Gordon, to whom the chief command was now delegated, "was absolutely against it, so it was not done." The amazing news of the royal desertion was not made known to them until they reached Aberdeen; and the general resentment it aroused was not lessened by the written farewell, in which James explained that he looked upon his remaining amongst them "not only as useless but even as destructive"; for his hurried manner of leaving them looked more like a panic-stricken regard for his own safety than calculated consideration for theirs. Mar states that while James was induced to make his escape only by his urgent representations, he and others joined him in the ship only because he was pleased to order them "positively

to go along with him." Thus while neither James nor Mar wished to make his escape, the one, it would seem, persuaded the other to do so!

To avoid English enemies a course was kept towards Norway and then to Gravelines, which was reached on the 10th. Thence James, proceeding by Boulogne and Abbeville, on the 26th arrived at St Germain; but his presence in France being forbidden, he, after a condoling interview with his mother, went to an obscure lodging at Malmaison. An attempt at an interview with the Regent only led to a request for his withdrawal to Bar-le-Duc; but instead he transferred himself to the house of Olive Trant, a mistress of the Regent, in the Bois de Boulogne, which had for some time been the resort of a coterie of Jacobite spinstresses, scornfully alluded to by Bolingbroke as his "female ministers." Thence he sent Ormonde with a message to Bolingbroke dismissing him from his service. In a letter to the Regent he explained that he had done so owing to the report of a Jacobite agent from England; and Mar in a flattering letter to Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, states that it was the sentiments of the bishop that had caused James to part with him. But Bolingbroke was merely the scapegoat for Mar's failure. Neither Mar nor James apparently dreamed that the fiasco in Scotland was owing in the least to the rashness and incompetence of the one or the other or both of themselves. Mar, on the contrary, was blind enough or bold enough to lay the blame of its failure on the shoulders of Bolingbroke. "But for the neglect in France," the king's credit in Scotland, he said, "had yet been entire"; and according to him Bolingbroke was the prime neglecter. In a letter to Captain Straiton, Jacobite agent in Edinburgh, he asserted that Bolingbroke had been guilty of so great negligence that there was no passing it over. He did not, however,

venture to write this to Bolingbroke, who, in regard to a rumour of his negligence, contemptuously remarked in a letter to Mar that he had "lived long enough and acted well enough not to pass for a knave or a driveller." Mar may also have been partly misled by ignorance of material facts. He might not know, though James did, that Ormonde on 21st October wrote that he was requested by the Regent to keep secret from Bolingbroke that he had agreed to supply "a great number of arms and ammunition." Moreover had Mar but waited a little longer supplies would have reached him, for on 26th January 1716 Ormonde had written that he and Bolingbroke were expecting a speedy and favourable reply to their request for men, arms, and ammunition. Then, while in a memorial against Bolingbroke it was stated that "from the time of the king's embarking at Dunkirk" he had never written him, Bolingbroke had systematically sent detailed despatches which must have miscarried, for in a letter to Mar, 31st January—which Mar owing to his precipitate flight from Scotland did not receive—he remarks, "my despatches to the king are so very full."

On being offered the seals Mar coyly declined them: he "thought it better," so he wrote to a friend, "that the office should remain vacant for some time," though he complacently conjectured that he would be "obliged to be the man at last," which he was by at least the 6th April. Debarred by English protests from Bar-le-duc, James reluctantly took refuge in the pontifical city of Avignon, which, in a state of great dejection, he reached on the 2nd April. At first he intended, Mar says, to be "in a private way"; but the results of the abortive rising were seen in the arrival of a swarm of Jacobite exiles and their attendants to the number of about 500. In this court without a kingdom there was as strong a jealousy about royal favours, and as eager a

striving for nominal appointments and titular orders and honours, as if James had been actual monarch of Great Britain. As at Bar, the royal exile depended for his own ministrations on the local clergy; and though in a Papal city, his Protestant followers were permitted, in an occult fashion, to enjoy the ministrations of Dr Charles Leslie and Ezekiel Hamilton—"Old Mr Leslie," writes Mar, "reads prayers to us in the King's House, but in this country we must not make a noise about it."

The preliminaries of the treaty between England, France, and Holland, signed in October 1716, inflicted on James another stroke of ill-fortune—his removal beyond the Alps. Having, however, an excuse for delay from having been operated on for fistula, he sought to find a means of escape from so noxious a necessity. When also the emperor regretfully refused him an asylum, he announced to the Regent that he would not leave Avignon unless compelled by force, or unless by a show of force his removal was made to appear compulsory; but a satisfactory arrangement for his support was sufficient to make him set out for Italy on 6th February 1717. While at Modena, though his stay there was limited to three days, he fell so violently in love with the eldest of his female cousins, that he made a proposal for her hand; but the duke gave an evasive answer, and though the proposal had the ardent support of the Queen Mother and the Pope, the duke, after some months, definitely refused his consent. From Modena James went by Bologna to Pisaro, where he remained till May, when he resolved to pay a visit to Rome. So far as concerned Protestant England this was to throw discretion to the winds; but there were the compensations of a splendid reception and the assignment to him of the ducal palace of Urbino as a residence, with an annual income of 12,000 scudi. In

order to preserve the right to nominate the Irish Catholic bishops, he now further alienated Protestant opinion by appointing Cardinal Gualterino Protector of England; but later he evidenced his revolt from his mother's Catholic tutelage, by an order of 20th February 1718 for the dismissal of her almoner, Lewis Innes, and the prohibition of further interference of the St Germain's ministry in his affairs. This gave great distress to the Queen Mother, though before her death on 7th May she gently ordered her confessor to tell him "that she was in no way displeased."

While at Bologna James learned of the collapse of a conspiracy for a Jacobite rising in England, aided by Charles XII. of Sweden, and of the arrest of Gwellenborg, the Swedish ambassador in London. An attempt in October 1717 to promote his marriage to a daughter of the Czar Peter, and secure the united help of Russia and Sweden on his behalf, came also to nothing; and, later, the combination of Sweden and Spain for this purpose was made abortive by the death of Charles XII. at the siege of Frederickshall, 11th December 1718. In the same year Charles Wogan, sent on a second expedition for a bride, reported favourably of Clementina, daughter of Prince James Sobieski, both on account of the probably large dowry and her personal qualities, her beauty and her "sense, discretion, and evenness of temper," though he also discerned "a good measure of haughtiness in her composition." The proposal was accepted, but news having reached the emperor of the intended marriage, she was, after setting out to meet James at Bologna, arrested on 6th October along with her mother at Innsbruck. Hopeless of her release, James, after his arrival at Bologna, permitted himself to become so enamoured of a rich and beautiful heiress there, Maria Vittoria di Caprara, that he returned to Rome to procure the Pope's consent to a marriage to

her; and this on 2nd December he actually received. At the same time the captive Princess Sobieski continued to send him cheerful letters full of ardent resolve; and since also Wogan volunteered either to secure her liberation or undertake her rescue, James could hardly withhold his consent to the experiment.

But apart from his devotion to the other lady, a crisis in his affairs now demanded his special attention; and without waiting to learn the result of Wogan's diplomacy or adventures, he left Rome secretly on 8th February for Spain; and after a stormy and perilous passage from Nettuno, arrived on 8th March at Las Rosas in Catalonia. Two expeditions had, with the aid of Spain, been planned on his behalf. While Ormonde was to land with 5000 men in England, the Earl Marischal, with two frigates and a Spanish force of about 300, was to make for the Hebrides, and thence proceed to rouse and lead the Highland clans. James did not venture to accompany either expedition. They set out while he was paying his respects to the king at Madrid; and when, on 12th April, he reached Corunna, it was only to learn that the Spanish fleet had been dispersed by a storm, and many of the vessels so shattered that a second start would be for months impossible. This also was precluded by the disastrous ending of the Scottish attempt. Having reached Stornoway and crossed with 700 islanders to the mainland, where he was joined by 800 clansmen, the Earl Marischal was on 11th June routed by General Wightman at the pass of Glenshiel, the Spaniards surrendering and the leaders and most of the Highlanders escaping to the hills.

While James was in Spain the Princess Sobieski had, through a clever stratagem of Wogan, effected her escape, and after enduring with light-hearted courage the fatigues and discomforts of a very trying journey, had on 2nd May reached Bologna, where on the 9th she

was married by proxy, with however a proviso, prepared by James, that should she be prevented from joining him after the ceremony it should not hold good. Her romantic escape does not appear to have appealed to James, who may have been still hankering after the Bologna heiress. While she found an asylum in the Ursinal Convent, Rome, he lingered on in Spain until the fall of St Sebastian. Then setting out at last for Italy, he, after reaching the Episcopal palace of Montefiascone, sent for his bride, and the marriage was celebrated there on 1st September, after which they took up their residence in the Muti Palace, Rome.

Though his political outlook was now more dismal than ever, he continued mechanically to busy himself with the old chronic plotting. On the suggestion of Lockhart, his Scottish affairs were entrusted to a commission, which it was egregiously hoped that "the great Argyll" would be induced to join; but Argyll's restoration to favour, 6th February 1719, dispersed the sanguine day-dream. The birth of Charles Edward, 31st December 1720, tended, however, to stimulate enthusiasm; a new plot of Atterbury and others in England received also encouragement by the bursting of the South Sea Bubble; but internal dissensions, lack of money and foreign aid, and the watchfulness of England, combined possibly with the ineffectiveness of James, caused its gradual abandonment.

The congratulations on the birth of Henry Benedict, 5th March 1725, were speedily followed by the sensation of the deplorable domestic wrangle which for a time deeply injured the prestige of James, both with the Protestant and Catholic Jacobites. It originated in arrangements connected with the dismissal of Mar. With the sanction of James, Mar had, in 1721, agreed to accept a pension from the English Government. The expectation was that he would act the part of Jacobite

traitor, but he explained to James that he meant merely to mislead it. The effrontery of Mar and the infatuated weakness and blindness of James in condoning him are equally wonderful; but since his treachery gradually became only too evident even to James, he was, in December 1724, dismissed from his office, which on 5th March 1725 was formally bestowed on his brother-in-law, Colonel John Hay, created Earl of Inverness. Mrs Sheldon, the Catholic nurse of Charles Edward, and a close ally of Mar, being also dismissed, in August James Murray, brother of Lady Inverness, was, though a Protestant, appointed his governor, with the title of Earl of Dunbar.

The appointment of a Protestant governor to her son was bitterly distasteful to Clementina, who attributed it to the interested scheming of the Hays, and especially to the undue influence over James of Lady Inverness. But had the relations between James and his wife been otherwise cordial, she would hardly have openly flouted him by retiring, as she did, on 15th November, to the convent of St Cecilia. Indeed in one of his letters to her—of which he sent a copy to Lockhart for the edification of the Scottish Jacobites—he reminded her that for two years he had patiently borne her “bouderies,” and that when she would hardly speak to him or look on him, he had not even remonstrated with her. She, again, in a letter to her sister, the Duchess of Bouillon, affirmed that she “had been fretted for six years together with the most mortifying indignities and affronts that can be imagined,” and that there were strong and pressing reasons which compelled her to take the step she did. When he married her James appears to have been in love with another woman; and to her the tall, cold, listless man with the dark melancholy eyes must also have strikingly contrasted with the sprightly heroic adventurer of her

romantic imagination. His gloomy passivity fretted her warm and high-spirited temperament; and his absorption in affairs of which he permitted her to know nothing—a curious contrast with his previous close consultations with Olive Trant and other “female ministers”—deeply wounded her self-esteem. He, again, took credit to himself for the common correctness of his treatment of her: that he had not been stingy to her in money matters, and had continued to her “the same liberty she had always enjoyed of going out and coming home when she liked and corresponding with whom she thought fit.” This was all very good, no doubt, but a spirited wife expects more from a husband than cold forbearance and full liberty to amuse herself apart from him; and since he was, to say the least, on more genial, and politically on more confidential, terms with Lady Inverness than with her, it is hardly surprising that she became bitterly jealous of that lady, nor that Roman society, being what it was, credited that she had the usual ample grounds for her jealousy. Lockhart, while reporting the universal belief that the Countess was his mistress, states that he had been assured by those on whom he could depend that they had “seen nothing in his conduct that tended that way,” though he describes her “as a mere coquet, tolerably handsome, but withal prodigiously vain and arrogant.” If this, however, was her character, she could hardly have refrained from exercising, for her own purposes, her arts on James, who seems to have been at least as much ensnared by her as she wished him to be. If also he did, as Walton the English spy records, appear with the lady at the opera when the scandal was at its height, this was not likely to diminish belief in its truth; and the fact that the Pope and the ecclesiastics were altogether on the side of Clementina, tended to substantiate it, though Walton’s statement that the Pope accused James of

concubinage with the lady may be founded on misleading hearsay. Further, if James, after a vain attempt to induce his wife in September 1726 to accompany him to Bologna—on condition that Dunbar was replaced by Wharton and Lady Inverness left the palace until recalled by his wife—went thither, as Walton states, accompanied by Lady as well as Lord Inverness, he still further prejudiced his case. Then the publication of his own letters, without his wife's replies, was the reverse of satisfactory. His excuses, Lockhart tells us, were "little credited"; and the Jacobite clamour against the Hays became so universal that on 3rd April 1727 he nominally superseded Lord Inverness by Sir John Graham.

On learning of the death of George I., 10th June, on his way to Hanover, James, after sending an express for Lord Inverness, left Bologna for Nancy, and thence proceeded to Avignon; but the Clementina scandal pre-disposed both the English Jacobites and Spain against any action on his behalf. Before he left Bologna Clementina had announced her willingness to join him; but learning that Lord Inverness had been at Avignon, she declined to proceed further than Bologna, whither James returned to her in January 1728. Thence he wrote to Lord Inverness that he had settled "in a friendly way with her," by "giving her and taking to myself an entire liberty"; and he further remarked that she was leading "a most retired melancholy life," and that he had no hope she would alter it. The truth was that she had joined him only by ecclesiastical pressure. He was now also bent on the recall of Inverness; and, convinced that if Inverness returned without her consent she would make his life miserable to him, he began to contemplate a permanent separation from her. The death of Pope Benedict XIII. on 22nd February 1730 deprived her, however, of her especial

ecclesiastical support, and at the instance of Clement XII. she in December informed her husband of her assent to the return of Lord and Lady Inverness. But though Lord Inverness made his appearance he did so alone, and being convinced that his presence with James was offensive to many influential Jacobites, he, with the permission of James, retired to France. Henceforth James and his wife continued to tolerate each other, though, apart from religion, her life had become joyless; and she became more and more absorbed in devotions and austerities, until gradually failing health brought about her death, 18th January 1735.

The strained relations between James and his wife caused an almost complete lull in Jacobite activity, but the approaching manhood of Charles Edward tended to its renewal. Proposals for a rising in the Highlands, which began to occupy attention in 1737, gradually led to the ill-fated French attempt of 1744, followed by the brilliant futilities of the '45. Disillusioned by repeated disappointments, James, although consenting to his son's proceeding to Paris, did so with misgivings. On learning of the disaster to the French fleet, he advised him to join the French army in Flanders and wait for better times. When Charles was disappointed in this, his continued residence in Paris in the company of dubious adventurers gave him much concern. The decision of Charles to proceed without foreign help to Scotland disconcerted as much as it surprised him; and recognising that he himself had now become a mere cipher in Jacobite counsels, he proposed the resignation of his rights in his favour. Against this, however, Charles protested as prejudicial to the cause; and his father did what he could, though in vain, to secure French and Spanish aid on his behalf.

It would have been better for both had Charles met a stainless hero's death at Culloden. His headstrong

fooleries were peculiarly distressing to his frigid and circumspect father, and they immediately confirmed the Duke of York in his resolve to adopt the ecclesiastical vocation. To his wishes James in 1747 agreed without consulting his wilful elder son—a decision which, since it severely prejudiced the prospects of a Restoration, filled Charles with amazed indignation.

Though cherishing a strong affection and respect for his son the cardinal, James, who was capable, with all his passivity, of narrow pugnacity about small matters, allowed himself to get for a time into embittered relations with him about various ecclesiastical trifles; but some allowance must be made for the irascibility caused by evil fortunes and chronic ill-health. The two combined tended also gradually to break his spirit and quench his interest in life. As early as 1760 Horace Mann refers to him as “totally indifferent to all affairs both of a public and domestic nature”; but he still lingered on, a frail, lonely, forsaken, and latterly paralytic old man, respected and honoured by ecclesiastics for his Catholic devoutness, but courted only by needy Jacobites, who, while dependent on his bounty, had ceased to reckon him of political account. He died 1st January 1766. He had desired to be buried in the church of the Holy Apostles; but by the Pope’s decree he was, with the elaborate pomp and ceremony appropriate to royalty, laid in the crypt of St Peter’s beside his wife Clementina.

The adverse fortunes of James Francis Edward were mainly the creation of his father. He was the victim of his father’s portentous mistakes, and of his father and mother’s ecclesiastical tuition. As a Protestant successor of a Protestant king he might have been a fairly successful sovereign; but adventure and enterprise were alien to his temperament, and the task of establishing a Catholic sovereignty in Britain was a

merely impossible one. Thus while even a shadowy sovereignty, a sovereignty over Jacobite exiles and the reputed loyalty to him of many in Great Britain, was some compensation for the lack of anything more substantial, his endeavours to transform this sovereignty of dreamland into a reality involved him in a monotonous succession of cares, anxieties, and frustrations which made him in the end altogether weary of the world.

CHAPTER XVIII.

CHARLES EDWARD.—BEFORE CULLODEN.

CHARLES EDWARD LOUIS CASIMIR, SILVESTER MARIA, the last hope of the Jacobites, was born in the Muti Palace, Rome, at five o'clock in the afternoon of the last day of 1720; and an hour later was baptised in the chapel by the Bishop of Montefiascone. Notwithstanding Hanoverian rumours of physical feeblenesses and deformities akin to those of his great-grandfather and grandfather, he was not only physically unblemished, but an exceptionally robust and healthy child. A Mrs Hughes, his first nurse, was later aided and superintended by Mrs Sheldon, who won his mother's special confidence. For a short time the Chevalier Ramsay was his governor, but the break with Mar led to his dismissal and that of Mrs Sheldon, and the substitution of James Murray, created Earl of Dunbar, as his governor, with Sir Thomas Sheridan, a Catholic, as sub-governor.

Charles was a bright, romping, vivacious boy, very active in play and amusements, with a precocious delight in music. When little more than four years old he could play in a fashion on a small violin, and later he became a rather accomplished performer on the violoncello. He also learned to dance admirably, and charmed every one by his gaiety, grace, and frank self-possession. His chief gifts, however, were physical: a

strong and healthy body, admirable nerves, and splendid animal spirits. Though superficially quick and intelligent, and learning to speak French and English, besides what may be termed his native Italian, he had no aptitude for study; but loved games of all kinds, including "a Scotch game called goff," tennis, and shuttlecock. While only six years old, he showed great expertness in shooting blackbirds and throstles in the Borghese Gardens with a crossbow; and later he developed a passion for field sports. Overflowing with physical energy, he was a difficult boy to govern and restrain; and treating the gentle admonitions and reprimands of his father with polite evasion, he had by 1733 "got out of the hands of his governors," so far as learning was concerned. Dunbar, while describing him to his old patron Inverness as tall and strong and "the most beautiful figure in the world," confesses that "it is impossible to get him to apply to any study as he ought to do, or indeed in any tolerable degree, by which means the Latin goes ill on, but he speaks both French and Italian easily."

In August 1734, Charles, under the special care of his cousin, the Duke of Liria, and accompanied by his two governors, set out for the Spanish army engaged at the siege of Gaeta. Since it fell within six days of his arrival, his experiences of the excitements of war were soon cut short; but he paid a visit to the trenches where balls were hissing at least over their heads, and having arrived next day near the house of the duke which a little before had been pierced with cannon balls, he insisted on entering the house to witness the damage that had been done. "This," writes the devoted Dunbar, "must be published in England." Glowing but, it may be, not greatly exaggerated accounts were also sent his father of his popularity with the soldiers, with whom he delighted to mingle

and converse; and during his stay at the court of Naples, at the time of the king's coronation, he won golden opinions from every one. "My son's good behaviour," wrote his proud father, on the information of the politic Dunbar, "is prodigiously talked of"; but he was not so highly delighted with his son as this might imply. The badly spelt and phenomenally brief letters of Charles, to the effect that he had been "very good," drew from him a sharp rebuke for his "too natural aversion to all application and constraint."

In 1737 Charles, as the Count of Albany, made a tour through the principal cities of Italy, partly to widen his knowledge and his social experiences, but also to display his charming personality and get him talked and written about as the supremely desirable heir to the British throne. Fully conscious also of the part he had to play, he played it to admiration. The ambition of restoring the fallen fortunes of his house was already occupying his thoughts and hopes. It was to become an absorbing passion with him, and since he was nothing if not adventurous, he was likely to have a strikingly sensational, even if wholly futile, career.

It was about 1740, when he was in his twentieth year, that the first glimmerings of the dawn of his hoped-for period of glorious adventure and triumph began to show themselves. In that year Macgregor of Balhaldy came to Rome with the pledged band of the Highland chiefs and "beautiful plans" for a Scottish rising, backed by English co-operation and foreign aid. At first it was hoped that Spain would lend assistance, and when this proved delusive France was applied to. Balhaldy then went to England to incite and organise the Jacobites there; and the glowing reports of him and Butler, an Irishman in the service of France, convinced Louis XV. of at

least the possibility of effecting a diversion sufficiently serious to compel the recall of English troops from the Netherlands. The main interest of France in the fortunes either of the old or the young Chevalier was as a pawn in her own game against England; and since the embroilment of England in a Jacobite conflict would meanwhile be specially advantageous to her, a descent on England was decided on, and Balhaldy was sent, or permitted to go, to Rome for what may be termed the loan of Charles to give the necessary *éclat* to the undertaking. The French Government did not directly require or suggest that Charles should join the expedition; it left this proposal to be verbally communicated by Balhaldy. Balhaldy was, however, more than plausible, and Charles was fervently eager. James therefore, overborne, though not without strong misgivings, by his son's ardour, on 23rd December 1743, signed and sealed a commission appointing him to be "sole regent of our kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland," &c., "during our absence"; and arrangements having been made for the journey to Paris, Charles before break of day of 9th January set out on the pretence of joining a shooting party at Ciserna, for which Henry, who knew nothing of his brother's real intention, also set out a little later. Henry arrived at Ciserna, but Charles, sending word that he had been detained by a small accident, did not. Entering a post-chaise, behind which two saddled horses were conducted by a groom, he, after a while, on the plea of feeling cold, mounted his horse; and changing his wig and coat for others carried by the groom, he made for the Tuscan frontier. Travelling thence as a Spanish officer to Carrara he crossed to Genoa, and then went to Savona, where he embarked on a small vessel, which, sailing unsuspected through the English fleet, brought him to Antibes. He then journeyed day and

night by Avignon and Lyons to Paris, and after a fortnight there went to Gravelines, near Dunkirk.

Carrying 7000 troops under Marshal Saxe, whom Charles accompanied, the expedition set sail on 5th March, only to find its way to England barred by the English fleet under Sir John Norris, and to encounter on its retreat a terrible storm which sent many transports aground and caused the loss of many men and most of the arms and baggage. The French Government deemed it, therefore, inadvisable to make a second venture; and this all the more that later information seemed to indicate the unreadiness of the English Jacobites. Charles, it is true, was convinced that once landed he would meet little or no resistance; but it was his special foible always to cherish an Utopian view of possibilities.

Charles now remained *incognito* in Paris and its neighbourhood. Had Louis permitted, he would have joined the French army in Flanders; but he did not dream of returning again, bootless and hopeless, to the old, dreary, make-believe pomp and state of the Muti Palace. Notwithstanding his father's anxious admonitions to "avoid precipitate and dangerous measures," he, in the spring of 1745, began secret preparations for an expedition to Scotland on his own responsibility. Having by money lent by his adherents and the pawning of the Polish crown jewels purchased 1500 guns and 1000 broadswords, and obtained the use of a French privateer brig, the *Doutelle*, and a man-of-war, the *Elizabeth*, which a French merchant had obtained to cruise on the English coast, he counted himself sufficiently equipped for beginning the great adventure of his dreams. His father's deprecatory attitude had only whetted the fire of his impatience; the supineness of France but stung him to more impetuous resolve; the averseness of the

Highland chiefs to move in his support without definite arrangements for foreign aid, but suggested the urgent need of his presence among them to inspire them with his own ardour. As soon as his arrangements were beyond being countermanded, he with cool, yet adroit, flattery wrote to his royal parent: "Your Majesty cannot disapprove a son's following the example of his father; you yourself did the like in the year '15"; and with a naïve avoidance of his reasons for assuring him that the circumstances are now "much more encouraging," he contented himself with remarking that "the particulars are too long to explain, and even impossible to convince you by writing, which has been the reason that I have presumed to take upon me the management of all this without ever letting you suspect that there was such a thing a-brewing." Having thus given his father to understand that on a matter that, for good or evil, would cardinally affect the future of the dynasty, his opinion was a negligible one, he further tells him that he had been "obliged to steal off without letting the King of France so much as suspect it," and this for two very good reasons: (1) "they might have stopped me," and then "made a merit of it to you, by saying that they had hindered me from doing a wild and desperate thing"; and (2) "my being invited by my friends would not be believed, or would have made little or no impression on the French court." But if he had a written invitation to show, it could not but be believed: the difficulty was that he had no sufficient invitations, and that any reasons he could have adduced for his hot-brained adventure would have aroused the mere merriment of the French Government. Two precautions for success he, however, did not neglect: he wrote to the French king, whose ships and men he had taken the liberty to borrow, that "the least

help will make the affair infallible"; and he appointed Sir Thomas Geraldine to "demand succours" from Spain "in my name to complete the work."

Delayed by unfavourable winds, Charles, on 2d July, wrote to his father that he would embark "this afternoon"; and after mentioning, among other things, that he had a company of sixty gentlemen volunteers, who, if they landed, would, though few, "make a show, they having a pretty uniform," he calmly adds—"We have nothing to do now but to hope in the Almighty's favouring us and recompensing our troubles." And thus in the blessed assurance that he had stolen a march on friends as well as foes, and was reading not merely his father but two great European Powers a lesson in daring and enterprise, he set out with his two ships, his sixty volunteers in the pretty uniform, and eight other companions—the attainted Duke of Atholl, Sheridan (his late governor), four obscure Irishmen, a free-lance Scot, and a Highland merchant—resolved, as he told his father, "to conquer or die." He was also perfectly confident of conquering, for he reasoned thus: Once I actually appear amongst them, the son and accredited Regent of their sovereign, to do battle for the throne of my ancestors, the bulk of the clans cannot hesitate to follow their Royal Prince. Then is it possible to credit that the thousands of my sympathisers in England, once they know that Scotland is with me, will be backward in my support, or that France and Spain will not take full advantage of the glorious opportunity for success which my dexterity and daring will now at last provide for them? Had also the response of the clans been so general as he fondly anticipated, had thereupon a wave of Jacobite enthusiasm overspread lowland Scotland and England, and had France or Spain distracted and confounded the English

Government by fitting out a powerful expedition, then Britain might have been involved in at least a very serious civil war. But these calculations were inspired mainly by the day-dreams of inexperience; and the chief qualifications of Charles for the tremendous task he had set himself were, apart from his royal prestige, unlimited confidence and unflinching resolution. These might carry him pretty far, but in the end they were to delude and ruin him.

The sixty volunteers in the pretty uniform were never to make any kind of show amongst the kilted Celts. The *Elizabeth*, in which they had been embarked, was so damaged in an encounter with a British man-of-war, the *Lion*, that she had to return to Brest. After the *Lion*, which was also damaged, had sheered off, it was reported to those on board the *Doutelle* that "between thirty and forty officers and gentlemen were killed or wounded"; and it would seem that none of those not *hors de combat* showed any inclination to come on board the *Doutelle*, in which Charles—without his convoy—continued his voyage until, on the 23rd, he reached Eriska, a small Hebridean island adjoining South Uist. There he was visited by Alexander Macdonald of Boisdale, who strongly advised him to return to France, stating that both his brother, Sir Alexander Macdonald of Sleat, and Macleod of Macleod were entirely opposed to the enterprise; which would seem to show that Murray of Broughton's story about the resolve of Macleod to join him was, to say the least, a misapprehension. Charles was not dismayed by these representations. He set sail not for France, but for the Scottish mainland, and on the 25th landed at Borradale, a farmhouse at Arisaig. Thence he sent Macdonald of Kinlochmoidart to summon Murray of Broughton, who had been in the Highlands on his

behalf, the Duke of Perth, and Lochiel; and also sent Macdonald of Clanranald to communicate with Sir Alexander Macdonald of Sleat and Macleod of Macleod. Clanranald, finding these two influential chiefs totally opposed to the enterprise, advised Charles not to proceed further. But, it is said, Charles, looking round, saw signs of sympathy and excitement in a young stripling of the clan, and turning to him exclaimed, "Will *you* not assist me?" "I will," replied the young enthusiast, "though no other man in the Highlands draws his sword." The passionate ardour of the young man proved contagious, and the Clanranalds put their lives at his service. All now turned on whether Charles could win over Lochiel, the chief of the Camerons. While his clan was one of the largest, he was one of the most popular of the chiefs; and the feats of his grandfather were in the mouths of all the Highland bards. He had sent his brother, Dr Archibald Cameron, to advise Charles against proceeding further, but at the request of Charles he agreed to come to Borradale to discuss the situation. This was a fatal step for him, since, though his cool judgment might be against the venture, he and his ancestors were devoted supporters of the Royal Stewarts, and his temperament was akin to that of his heroic grandfather, whose prowess on behalf of Charles II. and whose splendid support of Dundee at Killiecrankie had made him the most renowned Highland warrior of the age. It was thus almost impossible for Lochiel to resist the impassioned and plausible appeals of the Regent of his sovereign; and in the end he agreed to join him, provided Macdonald of Glengarry gave it under his hand to raise his clan and do likewise; and this Glengarry did.

Charles had done his best against himself by arriving at the very time when his friends were greatly

disheartened by the fiasco of the previous year, and when nothing was in readiness. Murray of Broughton affirms that he had sent him word that the general opinion was against his coming. This message, if sent, Charles did not receive; but even had he received it, most likely it would not have altered his purpose. Yet his semi-sovereign authority, the glamour of his youthful and royal personality, his declared resolve in any case to take the field, and his confident assurances of English and foreign co-operation, exercised a great constraining influence on the more generous and ingenuous Highland chiefs. Though memories of the '15 and the '19 sobered the enthusiasm of many who otherwise might have rushed to his standard, those who came into immediate contact with him felt it hard to resist his ardour and their own love of adventure. The majority could not be reached by his immediate personal persuasion; but on the western mainland he was so successful that when, on the 19th August, he set up his standard at Glenfinnan, the muster amounted to about 1600 men; and one of his followers remarked that he never saw him in higher spirits than when he had got his men round his standard. But the early auguries of accessions were deceptive. Whether, had he marched towards Inverness before proceeding south—as the slippery Lord Lovat graciously recommended—the Frasers and other north-eastern clans would have immediately joined, they were, meanwhile, in no haste to do so; and although, on the way south, threats of havoc and burning, and what Cluny Macpherson euphuistically termed “soothing close applications,” were employed to secure followers, the muster, when Perth was reached, numbered only about 2500, and one-half were but imperfectly armed. They were, however, full of fiery confidence, largely communicated

by the bearing and assurances of Charles. They could not have had a more inspiring leader. If his generalship was still to seek he was superbly endowed with boldness. He had also made up his mind to set his men an example of hardihood, having previously deliberately trained himself to endure fatigue in view of such a possible campaign; and, as Lord Elcho remarked, he "had a body made for war": he was healthy, strong, agile, of adamant nerve—"a first-class fighting man." In this respect he was an ideal leader for the Highland clans; and marching on foot with them, clad in the bravery of the Royal Chieftain of their race, he aroused amongst them a kind of idolatrous affection.

The small band of adventurers were also emboldened by the knowledge that the Government was badly prepared to oppose them. While the appearance of Charles in the Highlands had taken the chiefs by surprise, his unexpected arrival had greatly bamboozled the Lowland authorities. Cope, the general in the Lowlands, had but 2000 men; and had he been in Charles's pay he could not—whether owing to the directions of his superiors or his own decision—have better played the game of Charles than he did. Being ordered or advised, or deeming it best, to "secure the chain of fortresses across the Highlands," he—leaving some troops of dragoons to keep watch and ward over Stirling and Edinburgh—with 1400 men and 1000 stands of arms, for those who on the way might be disposed to join him, set out to beard Charles and his men in their Highland fastnesses, and crush the movement before it became formidable. It looked almost as madcap an escapade as that of Charles; but it has to be considered that after the '15 there had been at least a formal disarmament of the clans, and he may have been guided largely by the opinion of Lord President Forbes of Culloden, who was

exerting his influence, and with some success, to prevent the chiefs from joining Charles. Cope, however, obtained no recruits. The more, also, he advanced through the wild mountain regions, with their narrow passes, their frowning rocks and their mysterious recesses, he became less and less enamoured of his adventure; and finding the lofty pass of Corryarrick to be held by the followers of Charles, he discreetly, but ignominiously, turned tail towards Inverness. Apart from his scare, he might suppose that his presence there would overawe the clans in that neighbourhood. It had the immediate effect of preventing north-eastern accessions to Charles, but none at all in hindering his southward progress; and since it is far from certain that Charles could have defeated him had he made a stand at Dalwhinnie, we may, on the whole, conclude that next to tempting providence at Corryarrick, the best thing he could have done to serve the purposes of Charles was to retreat north to Inverness and settle himself there. This he may have recognised when Charles, quite regardless of him, continued his southward march, but he did so when it was too late. Not daring to follow in the tracks of Charles, he was compelled to have recourse to the diverting and dilatory expedient of sending for transports to convey his troops south for the defence of Edinburgh.

The predicament in which the plodding Cope had placed himself immensely augmented the confidence of Charles and his followers. Most likely also it had the important consequence of deciding Lord George Murray to cast in his lot with Charles at Perth. With his eldest brother, the attainted Duke of Atholl, Lord George had been concerned in the affair of Glenshiel in 1719, had been pardoned, and was now sheriff-depute of Perth. He had interviewed Cope, or Cope had interviewed him at Crieff on Cope's way north; and he had

officially expressed to the Lord Advocate his hope that "these troubles would soon be over." Probably he then thought they would—that Charles, unable to secure sufficient followers, would return to France. But at heart he was a Jacobite; and his eldest brother had sailed with Charles and unfurled his standard at Glenfinnan. When, therefore, the news reached him that Charles had stolen a march on Cope, and leaving him in the lurch was boldly advancing southwards, summoning all on his march to join him, the impulse to come to his support was more than he could resist, especially since the confident advance of Charles seemed to show that he had substantial reasons for expecting immediate English and foreign co-operation.

From his military experience and tactical skill his adhesion to Charles was an immense piece of luck, and at first Charles seems to have been quite of this opinion. He appointed him one of his lieutenant-generals, the Duke of Perth, who had also come in at Perth, being the other. Unlike Lord George, the Duke was a Catholic, while his grandfather had been a confidential friend of James II., and his father had been with Mar in the '15. The young duke had thus a special claim on the goodwill of Charles; but he had no military experience, and all depended on the guidance of Lord George Murray. Without him Charles might not have won even Gladsmuir; and had he placed implicit confidence in him, though he might not, as the Chevalier Johnstone affirms, have won a crown, his campaign would probably have been more brilliant than it was. As a commander of Highland troops—whose methods, capabilities, and temper he thoroughly understood—Lord George was a not unworthy successor to Montrose or Dundee; but Charles reserved the chief command for himself, and Lord George could not work smoothly with incompetent colleagues. He did not, for he could

not, admit the military opinions of Charles or the Duke of Perth to be of much account; he despised the incompetent and roistering Irishman, O'Sullivan, whom Charles had made quartermaster-general; and he set little store by the factotum of Charles, Murray of Broughton. Jealous of his possible predominance, Murray and other bosom friends of Charles sought to poison the mind of Charles against him. That they were able to inspire Charles with grave doubts of his fidelity seems at first unaccountable. Lord George had no pardon to gain by betraying Charles; to retain the goodwill of the Government he had only to hold aloof from him or take the field against him. Did Charles then imagine that Lord George was coveting the £30,000 that was set upon his head? Or what benefit did he suppose Lord George might gain by his treachery that he might not have gained by refusing to join him? Or did he suppose that Lord George would betray him from mere badness of heart? Or could he imagine that any worldly benefit Lord George would gain by his treachery could compensate him for the immortal infamy he would incur amongst his own people and every dweller in the Highland hills? Yet Lord Elcho tells us that at his own first interview with Charles on joining him at Craigshill near Edinburgh, Charles told him that he knew Lord George had joined him only to betray him; and he warned Elcho, whom he made his aide-de-camp, to be on his guard against him. The more signal the services rendered by Lord George to Charles, the more did his suspicion of him appear to increase; and while it was augmented by his immense military influence over the Highland chiefs, it was still further deepened by inability, on various critical occasions, to recognise the justness of his strategical decisions; for with Charles the only strategy was the reckless resolve to believe in what Lord George deemed

impossibilities and to fight at all hazards. That notwithstanding the splendid services of Lord George and the unstintedness with which he exposed himself to danger on his behalf, he should, in the end, even have convinced himself that his calamities were mainly traceable to Lord George's devilry, was significant of a certain mental obtuseness, and a peculiar twist in his character which were fatally to display themselves during the period of his disappointed hopes and his vain battles with misfortunes.

At Perth, where various other persons of influence came in, a few days were spent by Lord George in drilling the clans in the more simple manœuvres and instructing them how to act together; and without waiting for further recruits, it was resolved, as soon as the commissariat was in order, to proceed to Edinburgh. It was desirable to anticipate Cope; and the small force was encouraged also to make the desperate venture by, according to the Duke of Perth, assurances that French forces, to the number of 10,000, were actually embarked and only waiting a fair wind to set sail, and that a "considerable insurrection would presently appear in the north and several parts of England."

On the 11th September Charles, after returning from viewing ancient Scone, set out from Perth with his small motley array of caterans on his great southern venture. After proceeding along the level uplands, the scene of the retreat from Sheriffmuir, they turned westwards from Dunblane to Doune and then south to the fords of the Forth at Frew, six miles above Stirling, which they reached on the 13th. Without attempting to dispute the passage, the 350 dragoons under Colonel Gardiner, encamped near Stirling, galloped off to Linlithgow; and the kilted followers of Charles, with Charles himself at their head, waded through the river. Keeping to the westwards of the Castle, from which some

cannon shots were fired without effect, they proceeded by St Ninians and Bannockburn to Callendar House, in the grounds of which they bivouacked, Charles occupying the mansion. During the night, Lord George set out with 500 men to surprise the dragoons at Linlithgow, but found they had left it. They had gone on to Coltbridge, where they were joined by Hamilton's dragoons from Leith. Orders were now issued to them by General Guest, governor of Edinburgh Castle, to retire eastwards beyond Edinburgh. Some of them who had gone to reconnoitre the enemy had meanwhile encountered a few horsemen of Charles who had fired their pistols at them, whereupon they retreated in some perturbation on the main body. The incident quickened compliance with the orders of General Guest, and they galloped rapidly by the long dykes—now occupied by George Street—past Edinburgh towards Musselburgh. The “canter of Coltbridge” was not an encouraging spectacle for the Edinburgh volunteers; but it is hardly surprising that in the exceptional circumstances—the sole charge of defending Scotland being committed to them—the nerves of the dragoons in the end got a little upset. The instructions of General Guest, who from the Castle commanded a wide outlook, implied also that they were in imminent danger. Then the disappearance of Cope has to be considered, and his inability to return by land. Though they may have been assured that transports were carrying his men south, the rank and file might be excused if they hardly credited the strange story. They might well entertain the suspicion that his forces had been routed by the hosts now advancing upon them from the hills into which he had disappeared.

As for the 400 Edinburgh volunteers—even had there been no leaven of Jacobitism among those in authority—what stand could they be expected to make,

even with the aid of some kind of walls, against a force deemed more than ten times their number?

In the midst of the perplexity caused by the collapse of the dragoons and the volunteers, and the arrival of a demand from Charles for the surrender of the city, news were brought of the approach of Cope's transports to Dunbar; and a deputation was sent to Charles to ask for delay to consider his demand. The deputation, which returned late on the 17th with a refusal, had been followed by Lochiel's Camerons; and as the Nethergate port was opened for the return of their coach to the coach-house and stables in the Canongate, the porter was seized, and Edinburgh immediately found itself in the possession of the kilted Celts.

Next forenoon Charles on horseback, with a Highland bodyguard, and followed by his whole array of picturesque followers, made a detour round the south of the city, and proceeding by Prestonfield and the Hunter's Bog, with augmenting and shouting multitudes welcoming his approach, rode to the palace of his forefathers at Holyrood, his followers encamping on the King's Park. A spectator describes him as "a slender young man" [he was wiry rather than slender], "about five feet ten inches high; of a ruddy complexion, high nose, large rolling brown eyes." In his "short tartan coat, without the plaid, a blue bonnet on his head, and on his breast a star of the order of St Andrew," he seemed, at least in the eyes of the ladies, the very beau-ideal of a Royal Scottish Prince; and his youth and the boldness of his enterprise evoked from many who did not sympathise with his cause a good deal of emotional sympathy and enthusiasm for himself. Hard on his arrival at Holyrood, pursuivants and heralds marched in their antique bravery to the Cross, where they proclaimed James as king and Charles as regent. Smiling ladies waved their handkerchiefs from the windows, and

beviess of them in fair attire surrounded the Cross, with the beautiful Mrs Murray of Broughton in the midst of them on horseback, with a drawn sword in her hand and a white cockade on her breast.

After the adverse attitude of the magistrates' deputation Charles must have been more than surprised at the warmth of his reception by the crowds of shouting citizens. "The whole scene," writes a lieutenant with the expedition, "was rather like a dream, so quick and amazing was the change"; "though," he adds, "wise people saw well enough we had much to do still." They had much more to do than Charles probably supposed; the enthusiastic shouts meant less than he may have flattered himself they did; the glittering ceremonials were more entertaining than efficacious; and even if the tide of sentiment seemed to be turning in his favour, more than shouts and sympathy were needed for the stern work he had on hand. There was the pressing question of how to deal with the approaching Cope; a defeat by him would be wellnigh fatal; a victory over him, how far-reaching might not be its effect?

Meanwhile Charles had but his 3000 clansmen for the task he had set himself, not merely against Cope but the Hanoverian Government, and there were no immediate signs of great accessions to his standard. Soon after he entered Holyrood several lowland noblemen and gentlemen joined him; but by those whom Lord Elcho terms "the mob who were so very fond of seeing him," no eagerness was shown to enlist in his service, although when, in the afternoon, a drum beat up for volunteers, an inconsiderable number joined the Duke of Perth's regiment. On learning that Cope, who on the 17th had disembarked his forces at Dunbar, had moved to the west of Haddington, it was decided not to await his approach but to attack him near Musselburgh Bridge if he was approaching it. Early

on the 21st the insurgents set out from Duddingstone, where they had been encamped, Charles in front of them, drawing his sword and exclaiming—"Gentlemen, I have flung away the scabbard; with God's assistance I don't doubt of making you a free and happy people." The opposing forces numbered each about 3000, but while Charles had only some 40 horse, Cope had 600 and a number of cannon, which were much dreaded by the Highlanders, and at Pinkie Cleugh, some 200 years previously, had caused a complete panic amongst them. As they neared this same Pinkie it was reported that Cope, instead of keeping to the high grounds, was hugging the shore below Tranent; and Lord George Murray therefore hastened to seize the sloping heights which were topped by Carberry Hill, the scene of the historic parting between Mary and Bothwell, and of Mary's surrender to her Protestant forces. Thence they looked down on Cope's army drawn up in line of battle on the northern plain from Tranent to the sea. An attempt was made to seize the churchyard of Tranent, but it was found to be exposed to Cope's cannon; and some skirmishing also revealed that it was Cope's purpose to be content with his strong position and remain on the defensive. His supineness greatly encouraged the Highlanders, and their "common conversation was how to catch Cope." But this was the difficulty: how was he to be rushed in the approved Highland fashion? His position was a very strong one, his left being protected by Colonel Gardiner's park wall and the village of Tranent, and his right stretching down to Cockenzie and the sea, while in front there was a treacherous morass with a thick hedge and deep ditch. He had made it impossible for himself to attack the enemy with any chance of success; his hope was that the wild clansmen, whom he supposed outnumbered him by two to one, would be mad enough to attempt to storm his

position; and but for Lord George Murray they would readily enough have fallen into the trap that had been laid for them. Afraid that Cope might escape them during the night, they were anxious to attack him at once in broad daylight; but they were restrained, a night attack being resolved on. When a council was being held to consider how this could be best effected, an East Lothian gentleman informed them of a circuitous path by which they might round the morass and get in near contact with Cope's front. The men were therefore called to arms and arrangements made as to their depositions and the plan of attack; and at three o'clock in the morning a long line of kilted clansmen passed down the narrow lane, swiftly and silently, and rapidly arranged themselves in their assigned positions. Cope, who had continued in the lines all night, had received information from the patrols that the enemy were moving from their ground eastward; and hardly had the last Highlander passed the defile when an alarm cannon was fired, and the men, who had lain on their arms all night, were quickly in position. Still they could hardly suppose that the enemy were ready to charge full at them. They might well, therefore, be struck with sheer amazement when, just as the morning mist was clearing away, there was a rattle of musketry close in front, a wild yell, and an impetuous rush of men, sword in hand, towards them. Cope's battery fired an almost harmless round and was immediately seized by the Camerons; the dragoons, as if petrified, made no attempt to charge, and as soon as they were fired on broke and fled, as Charles said, "like rabbits, one by one"; with their right flank exposed and smitten, the foot, as if by a common impulse, gave way to sheer despair; and in not much more than five minutes the whole of them were either in flight, or slain, or taken prisoners. Very few of the foot escaped.

According to Elcho, 500 were killed and 1400 taken prisoners, including 900 wounded; while the loss of the Highlanders in killed and wounded was about 150 men. The only mitigation Cope could report was that he had collected about 450 dragoons, with whom he was marching towards Berwick.

While the rapidity and overwhelming character of the victory is accounted for largely by the panic of the dragoons, the splendid individual fighting qualities of the Highlanders and the sudden impetuosity of their attack might in any case have turned the day in their favour. Over and over again, under Montrose and Dundee, they had shown their ability to put regular troops to rout; and their triumph at Gladsmuir was achieved by their exceptional prowess and *élan*. Thenceforth Charles, Lord Elcho tells us, "entertained a mighty high opinion of the Highlanders," though his conviction that they could "beat four times their number of regular troops" was tinged with that fond extravagance of anticipation without which he would not have launched himself on his wild enterprise.

The wildness of the enterprise was not then manifest to the chiefs and other officers of Charles, for the simple reason that they trusted to his glowing version of the facts and possibilities which bore no similarity to what his prepossessions and extravagant anticipations supposed them to be. As the exultation at their brilliant triumph died away affairs began, however, to assume a graver aspect in his eyes and theirs. It had, in truth, achieved but little for them—so little that it marked the summit of their success, which was never more than a merely shadowy one. But meanwhile Scotland was in the hands of Charles and his small band of rude mountaineers, and there was none to gainsay his commands and exactions. For some six weeks he remained the undisputed possessor of the

ancient palace of the Scottish kings amid all the pomp and parade associated with sovereignty. In the morning levees of officers and men of rank filled the reception rooms, and in the evening they were gay with assemblies of ladies, and later with music and dancing as in Scotland's brave days of old. "All the fine ladies," says Forbes of Culloden, "if you will except one or two, became passionately fond of the young adventurer." This was all very gratifying and imposing: it was at least a magnificent advertisement for Charles; but so far as it caused him to credit that already he possessed any real sovereign authority, so far he was living in a mere fool's paradise. Also, if at first he was inclined to credit it, he was not permitted to do so long. Vexations and difficulties gradually made inroads on his hopefulness, and care and anxiety commenced to sit on his brow. "Jupiter" Carlyle, observing him at Holyrood gate, "beheld his countenance thoughtful and melancholy." "He seemed," so the Hanoverian, but shrewd, young man remarked, "to have no confidence in anybody, not even in the ladies, who were much his friends." He and his council were, in fact, by no means at one as to what was to be done with their victory. Both he and they were beginning to be more disappointed than elated by its results, for instead of bringing crowds of Lowland Scots to his standard, it was merely making it clear that, as a whole, Lowland Scotland was not for him but against him. There was evidently now but little fire in the belly of whatever Jacobitism might there survive.

Again, no signs appeared of the risings in the North of England which at Perth he had announced as immediately to happen. After his victory he sent thither an envoy to notify to his friends his "wonderful success"; but no one there paid attention to his warnings that they would be "inexcusable before God and man if they

did not do all in their power to assist and support him." Thus in England the only effect of Cope's defeat was to make the Government take a serious view of the raid and to organise a formidable force to suppress its consequences. Then the story of the 10,000 French troops ready to embark as soon as they had a favourable wind was now seen to have been merely a beautiful myth: though Charles was now assured, in substance, that if his affairs continued to prosper troops would by-and-by be sent. As a kind of pledge of this, various vessels arrived at Montrose with artillery, ammunition, money, and in all about 10,000 stands of arms—a most opportune gift if Charles had, as he boasted he would have, abundant followers to make use of them. France wished to encourage him to persevere, for his perseverance, whatever in the end might be his fate, was meanwhile to the advantage of France. Since also he had gone upon his adventure without consulting her, she was treating him fairly and reasonably enough, if with no romantic generosity. But if as yet the Hanoverians had no great hold over popular sentiment in Britain, the small effect produced by the dramatic appearance of Charles on the scene seemed to show that, even since the '15, Jacobitism had greatly lost ground both in Scotland and England. There were many, it may be, still Jacobite by traditional sentiment; but there were much fewer than of yore disposed to venture their lives on its behalf.

Such being the situation of Charles and his followers, his consultations with his council could hardly be so happy and harmonious as they had been before Glads-muir, and during the rapturous days that immediately followed it. When the joy of triumph had spent itself, they found themselves faced with the problem of what to do with it, which became the more puzzling the longer it was discussed. The difficulty of its solution

was aggravated by Charles's incapability of discerning the realities of the situation. Hence the frequent inability of the majority of the council to coincide with his opinions; and although, so Elcho asserts, but for their advice, he would often have fallen into serious blunders, he yet "could not bear to hear anybody differ in sentiment from him, and took a dislike to everybody that did": an exaggeration possibly, though there is evidence enough that it had a substantial basis of truth.

Only in the Highlands did the Gladsmuir triumph produce much effect in favour of Charles. As a Highland victory it caused there no little exultation. Many also of the victors returned gleefully to their glens with booty, much of it quite strange and novel, to their primitive households; and they spread tales of the wonders of Edinburgh and of the splendours of Charles in his royal palace. A wave of excitement thus spread over the wild northern regions, and Charles took advantage of it to send emissaries to the chiefs who had not yet joined him. He especially made earnest overtures to Macdonald of Sleat and Macleod of Macleod, affirming that he had now "undoubted assurances from France and Spain"; but though they at first seemed about to be carried away by the general enthusiasm, in the end they resolved to hold aloof. Possibly Macleod's intercourse with the wily Lord Lovat, whom he visited at Beaufort, partly accounts for their hesitation. Lovat, again, arranged that his son and the clan should, against his wishes, join Charles; but they were not to be precipitate; and thus Charles had gone to England before they began to move.

Besides accessions from the Highlands, a number of what Elcho terms "people of fashion" joined Charles, thus forming with their dependants a very much-needed body of irregular cavalry. Writing to his father on

15th October, Charles records that he had now near 8000 men and 300 horse; and the Frenchman, D'Eguilles, possibly on the information of Charles, reported his forces to number 10,000; but, according to Elcho, when Charles, at the end of October, reviewed his army at Duddingstone, he found the numbers to be 5000 foot and 500 horse; and this corresponds with the statements of the muster-master, cited in Home's *History of the Rebellion*. Charles, in his letter to his father, also announced that he would enter England in about ten days to have "one desive stroke fort" (*sic*). D'Eguilles urged him not to do so until he heard from France; but Charles hoped to force the hand of France by announcing his entrance into England, just as he had hoped to force it by announcing that he had set sail for the Highlands.

To the march into England Lord George Murray and the majority of the council were strongly opposed; there was no evidence of any readiness on the part of his friends there to join him; and without substantial aid from them nothing but disaster could result from the adventure. Wade, now marching north, could also be met with more chance of success in Scotland than in England, and a defeat by him in Scotland would be less irreparable. Then more accessions were still expected from the Highlands, and had Charles waited he would have been reinforced by 800 men, part Scots, part Irish, with whom Lord John Drummond landed at Montrose on 22nd November, bringing with him also cannon and military stores. But Charles had sent off his messages to France before consulting his council; and Elcho tells us that to their objections he replied that "he was sure a great body of English would join him upon his entering into that country, that the French would be landed before he could join them, and that in short everybody in London was for him, and would receive him as they

had already done at Edinburgh." To which, says Elcho, the answer was: "Everybody wished it might be true, and wished he might have authority for saying so."

As Charles was bent on the march into England, a kind of compromise was arrived at. Charles, possessed by his gratifying but merely extravagant notions of Highland prowess, wished to march by the east road to attack the 12,000 veterans under Wade, then near Newcastle; but Lord George Murray induced him to forego the prospect of this immediate triumph, and to adopt the western route by Cumberland and Lancashire. Charles was inwardly resolved at all hazards to get to London, but Lord George and the chiefs marched into England against their better judgment, and merely as an experiment to test whether his sanguine hopes of English support or the French landing had any real foundation. The full details of the hopeless expedition cannot here be recorded. Now elated and happy, Charles set his men a splendid example by marching on foot at the head of one of the columns, and his high spirits and confident bearing had their effect upon them; but their errand was a merely vain one. Their experiences were very much a repetition of those of Charles II. about one hundred years previously, except that he waited to be overwhelmed at Worcester. Before they reached Carlisle 1000 men had deserted; Cumberland was hostile; Carlisle and its castle had to be compelled to surrender; the goodwill in Lancashire was largely assumed to prevent reprisals; and when Manchester was reached Charles had been joined by only about 300 gentlemen and merchants and 300 of the common people, the majority of them mere vagabonds. Privately the chiefs expressed to Lord George the opinion that they had now done as much as could reasonably be expected of them; but by his earnest

advice they were induced to venture as far as Derby, though every step they took was becoming more and more perilous. They had bamboozled and evaded Wade, but the Duke of Cumberland with a large force was now known to be in Staffordshire. Lord George therefore, on 3rd December, undertook to deceive Cumberland by a feint movement on Congleton, while the main body marched to Derby, which they reached next day. They had thus placed themselves between the Duke and London. In the race for the capital he could have been outstripped by a day or two; and London when it came to know of the possible approach of the insurgents, supposed to number 12,000, got into a kind of panic, although a more numerous force than that of Charles was assembling at Finchley Common. Charles could have got there; and since the mere boldness of his venture, coupled with his evasion both of Wade and Cumberland, was bound strongly to affect the imagination of the troops at Finchley, the "canter of Coltbridge" might, with variations, have been repeated, and the picturesque mountaineers might have seized London as they had seized Edinburgh; and Charles, accompanied by huzzaing crowds, might have entered St James's as he had entered Holyrood. This was at least his fond and settled expectation. It would have been a far more impressive feat than the capture of Edinburgh; but, alas! also a still vainer one, for the French expedition, which was never to land, had not yet even set sail, and the 4000 desperadoes would soon have had to face much more than four times their number of armed men. Still, had Charles and his Highland hordes entered London in triumph, they would have won for themselves at least a unique and deathless renown; and Charles, had he perished in the adventure, would have done so in a blaze of glory, and have lived immortally in the Valhalla not merely of Jacobitism but of the world.

But no such happy destiny was in store for him or them. On 5th December Lord George Murray revealed to him the character of the military situation, and informed him that the council of officers were regretfully convinced of the absolute necessity of an immediate retreat. The decision was, of course, a death sentence on the fondest hopes of Charles ; and to return to Scotland after what had proved a mere wild-goose chase cut him to the heart. "Rather than go back," he exclaimed, "I would wish to be twenty feet under the ground." He broke out into wild abuse of his officers, and all that day continued "positive," Elcho tells us, "he would march to London"; but being unable, as he himself afterwards stated, to "persuade a single person" to join him, he at night informed his officers that he had "consented to go to Scotland"; though he also told them "he would have no more councils, for he would neither ask nor take their advice." It was not merely a very ungrateful but a very unwise decision ; and, but for the watchful care of Lord George Murray, it might have entailed overwhelming disaster. But they seem to have made allowance for his youthful delusions and his bitter disappointment ; and besides, they could not but admire the undauntedness of his resolve, though it would have been mere madness to have gratified it.

The retreat was begun next day. Charles felt so upset and ill as to be unable to walk, and mounting a horse he rode in deep dejection after the van. Lord George Murray undertook charge of the rearguard. Charles consulted no one, and by the bravado of halting a day at Lancaster, to indicate that he was merely retiring, he permitted the advance-guard of Cumberland to approach the rearguard on 17th December at Clifton ; but the brilliant sally of Lord George against the enemies dragoons prevented further molestation. Cherishing the hope of speedily re-entering England, Charles

took upon him to leave 400 men to garrison Carlisle, who were a mere prey to the enemy.

Edinburgh being now held for the Government, Charles marched to Glasgow. On reviewing the army on Glasgow Green, it was found that the losses on the march from England had been inconsiderable. As Glasgow was notoriously hostile, it was heavily taxed, as had been Dumfries, to provide clothes and shoes for his troops. On 3rd January he left it for the siege of Stirling Castle. Here he was reinforced later by Lord John Drummond with 4000 men, the 800 he brought from France having been joined by large accessions from the clans, so that the insurgents numbered now about 9000. Moreover, Lord John brought information that France was preparing a force of 9000 men and 1350 horse to land at Dungeness. Charles began, therefore, to dream that fortune at last was about to smile on him in earnest; but like all the previous projected landings from the time of his grandfather, this one also was destined to be frustrated. It was to set sail on Christmas Day, but a strong fleet in the Channel under Admiral Benson caused its abandonment.

By returning baffled from England, Charles had shown that he had there no effective support; and by his journey thither he had lost control of Lowland Scotland. The shrinking from a second attempt to occupy Edinburgh tended greatly to discredit him; his inactivity was leading to many desertions among the Highlanders, who could take no part in the siege of Stirling Castle; and his continued omission to consult the council of officers was causing strong dissatisfaction. To their proposal, 6th January 1746, that a council of war should be called from time to time, and that all operations should be decided on in his presence by the majority of a small committee chosen for this purpose, he snappishly replied that

his authority might be taken from him by violence, but that he would never resign it like an idiot. Since he was on such terms with his principal officers, it is surprising that the affair of Falkirk against General Hawley, on the wild rainy afternoon of 17th January, instead of a confused and muddled victory, did not turn out to be an overwhelming defeat. What, indeed, was achieved was achieved mainly by the alertness of Lord George Murray and the blinding storm of wind and rain. Small wonder was it, therefore, that while Charles was immensely elated by the victory, Lord George and the officers were merely thankful for the lucky escape. Even Sir Thomas Sheridan, in an account of the victory to an Irish friend, remarked: "To come to the bottom of the business, we are like the old man who said, 'Thank God I am in good health, but I shall very soon be dead.'" When on word reaching him that Cumberland was preparing to march westwards, Charles sent to ask Lord George to prepare a plan for the expected battle, Lord George and the chiefs represented that, with numbers rapidly declining from desertions, it would be impossible to stay longer "in so dangerous a situation"; but they declared that they were still firmly resolved "to stand by him and the glorious cause." Of the necessity of the proposed withdrawal beyond the Forth there could hardly be a question; but the announcement was a worse blow to Charles than that which dumfounded him at Derby, for it meant the resignation to the enemy of Lowland Scotland as well as England. When the paper reached him, he is said to have exclaimed, "Good God! have I lived to see this?" But his written answer was more considerate in its tone than his violent objurgations at Derby. "I am too sensible," he replied, "of what you have already done for me, not to yield to your

unanimous resolution if you persist in it." He, however, sent Sir Thomas Sheridan to insist on certain conditions. What they were does not appear; but in the end he affirmed that he washed his hands of all the fatal consequences of a retreat—consequences which he foresaw but could not help.

On the morning of 1st February the army recrossed the Forth, and on the 3rd reached Crieff; and marching by different routes, in three divisions, it began on the 18th to concentrate at Inverness. Cumberland did not arrive at Aberdeen until the 28th, and the insurgents took advantage of their respite to drive Lord Loudon out of Ross-shire and to capture Fort Augustus, but failed in an attempt on Blair Castle and Fort William. Charles at Inverness spent his leisure in shooting, and in the evening gave balls to the ladies, at which he led off the dance. He seemed to be in the gayest of spirits, and kept assuring every one that Cumberland's soldiers would be more likely to run away than fight against their lawful sovereign. Meantime the duke was cutting him off both from French supplies and his eastern sources of provisions; and since Charles had still ceased to consult with his council, he would have been better employed in making careful inquiry into his commissariat arrangements and superintending the organisation of his men. Had his plans been carefully considered beforehand, it is easy to conceive that the task of the duke would have been a much more difficult one than it turned to be. But even to the last he failed to realise the greatness of his peril, and, scorning to take up a strong position on the opposite bank of the Nairn, madly insisted on fighting Cumberland on an open and exposed plain. Thereupon Lord George Murray proposed a night attack; but, owing to their half-famished condition, the men,

failed to make a sufficiently rapid march, and day had dawned before they could come in touch with the enemy. Charles now desired that they should retain their positions; but either of their own accord, or at the suggestion of Lord George, they moved back to Culloden, where many of them left to seek provisions; and when word was brought of the appearance of the enemy, Charles still insisted on attacking. The officers, therefore, says Elcho, "endeavoured to get the men together as fast as possible; but as they were dispersed all over the country as far as Inverness, there was near two thousand of them that was not at the battle, so all the prince assembled was about five thousand men." And thus, on 16th April 1746, an overwhelming defeat brought the daring, but ill-advised and badly guided, endeavour of Charles to retrieve the fortunes of his dynasty to a sudden and complete collapse.

CHAPTER XIX.

CHARLES EDWARD—AFTER CULLODEN.

ACCORDING to Elcho, Charles, as soon as the left wing gave way, turned about his horse and never offered to rally any of his broken corps; but this does not agree with various other accounts of his conduct; and Charles himself affirmed that he was led off the field by those about him. For the next five months, until 20th September, his experiences were a kind of ruder, harder, and more diversified and thrilling version of those of Charles II. after Worcester. With 500 horsemen he passed into Stratharick; and after ordering the most of them to go to Ruthven, whither the right wing had retired, and wait for further orders, he sent a message advising them to disperse, and these orders were repeated at Ruthven by Lord George Murray and Lord John Drummond. On reaching Invergarry Castle Charles disguised himself as a servant, and attended only by O'Sullivan and a guide he set out for Borradale, where, apparently to disguise his purpose from Cumberland, or from his Scottish followers whom he had ceased to trust, he wrote letters to some of the principal officers asking them to meet him at Loch Arkaig, where he proposed to assemble

his scattered forces. At any rate, if at first he cherished this intention, he was persuaded to abandon it by O'Sullivan, who, having made the Scots his bitter enemies, was afraid to remain on the mainland; and the purpose of both was to get to the Hebrides with a view of escaping to France.

Of the adventures of Charles until he made his escape, of the noble faithfulness of those in whom he was compelled to put his trust, of their adroitness in outwitting the scattered thousands nearly everywhere on the watch for him, of his romantic journey, disguised as Betty Burke, in the companionship of Flora Macdonald from the Hebrides to Skye, of his hairbreadth escapes there and afterwards on the mainland, — no detailed account is here possible. His wanderings revealed, even more strikingly than did his campaigns, his matchless courage and his amazing hardihood and capacity of enduring fatigue and privation. For the most part he seemed, even in the face of imminent peril, to be perfectly unconcerned and cheerful, though sudden disappointments and provocations were apt to put him in one of his characteristic passions. The physical discomforts were alone enough to try the hardest constitution and cause despondency in the stoutest heart. One night, for example, they had to remain at the top of a hill in an open cave, where Charles "could neither lean nor sleep, being wet to the skin with the heavy rain that had fallen the day before, and having no fuel to make a fire, the only method of warming himself was smoking a pipe." In North Uist, where their boat was staved to pieces on a rock, and they did not until two days find another which was stranded on the coast, they had no provisions but a few biscuits saved out of the boat and entirely spoiled by the salt water. Again, compelled unexpectedly to keep

all night to the open sea, and having no food but raw oatmeal, they "began to make dramach with the sea-water," and Charles licked it up though the others stuck at the attempt. Then, one day as he lay with his companions on the face of a hill before a river that ran through Glenshiel, they "were sizen with such a drouth" that they "were like to perish," but dared not venture from the hill until evening, when they "all went stagern to the river side and drank water at no allowance." Occasionally what they deemed the skill of Charles as a cook added to the palatability of their simple meals; but we are told: "Never any meal or drink came wrong to him, for he could take a share of everything, be it good, bad, or indifferent, and was always cheerful and contented in every condition." Also, he won the peculiar regard of his Highland hosts and companions by his appreciation of, and power of resistance to, a dram. On the arrival of the trusty MacEachain at Stialay with provisions and a few bottles of brandy: "Come, come," said Charles, "give me one of the bottles and a piece of bread, for I was never so hungry in my life"; and after two or three hearty pulls at the liquor, he proceeded to his meal, and ate two or three times more than he had ever done before. He took care also, records MacEachain, "to warm his stomach every morning with a hearty bumper of brandy, of which he always drank a vast deal; for he was seen to drink a whole bottle of a day without being in the least concerned." On the desert island of Euirn they had sugar as well as brandy, and were able, till a blunder broke the earthenware kettle, to make "warm punch to cheer their hearts in that cold place"; and in a hut in North Uist he and his companions made merry for three days and three nights, when, says the admiring narrator, he still had the better of them,

though one was reputed to be "as able a bowlman" as in Scotland.

Often external hardships were but the smallest of their trials. For nights and days at a time there was the wearying pressure of sleepless care, the torturing sense of insecurity, the constant possibility of death or capture. Occasionally the whole region around them became alive with Cumberland's red-coats; and sometimes the fugitives would, ere they knew, find themselves almost walking into their midst; mounting a hill or emerging from a glen they would discover that they were all but surrounded by them; or a scout would come in with intelligence that one detachment was marching in front and another behind them; or having chosen what they deemed an admirable hiding-place, they would awake to find the enemy encamped on both sides of it. But never for an instant did Charles's presence of mind desert him or his courage waver; he faced perpetual danger and endured hardship with an unruffled and cheery fortitude.

For weeks at a time their only bed was the heather, though sometimes with the shelter of a cave,—it was usually too perilous to venture into a hut; but now and then they found themselves in comparative security, were lodged pretty comfortably, and fared, if not sumptuously, at least abundantly, every day. For three days they remained at a poor grass-keeper's bothy, and provided themselves in victuals by fowling and fishing; at the Forest House in Glen Corridale they stayed twenty days, the prince enjoying capital sport in "papping down" muircocks and hens, which, when cooked, were washed down by brandy drunk out of a clean shell; one night was passed in a cow-byre, where Charles, sitting in wet clothes, fell into an uneasy doze, starting suddenly in his sleep and staring "boldly in the face of every one of them, as if he meant to fight

them," and sometimes crying out, "O Poor England! O Poor England!" For three days they were entertained by the seven men of Glenmoriston in their famous cave, where they were "as comfortably lodged as if they had been in a palace"; one whole month was spent in a tent of fir branches in the Chisholm woods, "in peace and plenty"; and finally, after many wanderings, Charles arrived at Cluny's cave in Benalder, where, after some ten days, the joyful tidings reached him of the arrival of French ships in Lochnanuagh.

On 19th September 1746 Charles closed his adventurous episode in Scotland by embarking at Borradale on the French ship *L'hereux*, which, setting sail shortly after midnight, landed them without incident safely at Roscoff. Immediately on setting foot on French soil he wrote to his brother, urging the absolute necessity of arranging for an interview with Louis XV. "for to bring things to a write (*sic*) head"; and what he meant by this was that Louis should, on the instant, lend him 20,000 men "to repair the mistakes of the past." In a pamphlet of 1749 he is represented as making a brilliant entry to Versailles; but there is no corroboration of this, though he and his brother were graciously received by Louis at Fontainebleau, and on a Sunday evening had the honour of supping with Madame de Pompadour. His bold adventure, futile though it was, and his hard and perilous experiences in the Highlands, made him the lion of Parisian society, and on appearing at the opera he was vociferously applauded. Immensely elated by his popularity, he now confidently counted on immediate aid from Louis; and when, instead of this, he and his brother were offered the Hotel Montmartre as a residence with a pension of 12,000 livres, he could not restrain his indignation at such "a scandalous arrangement." He curtly informed Louis that he had not asked for a pension, but for assistance to restore the

fortunes of his dynasty; and finding it impossible to obtain a private interview with him, he finally wrote to him that as his situation at Paris did not correspond with the good reception accorded him at Fontainebleau, he had resolved to retire from France. Setting out on 25th January 1747 for Avignon, he then, without consulting his father, proceeded to Spain to lay his case before King Ferdinand; for, so he wrote to his father, "I never intend to give myself rest, either in mind or body, until I fail or bring off our Business"; but he apparently did not realise the immensity of his own previous failure; and as he had also superciliously broken off with the accredited Jacobite advisers of his father, and was in the hands of a small clique of boon companions and flatterers, he was bound only to damage and not advance his cause by the harum-scarum diplomacy he adopted. His visit to Spain was the reverse of welcome, and though, in the end, he obtained a midnight interview with the King and Queen of Spain at Guadalaxara, they, while receiving him kindly and presenting him with 3000 pistoles for the expense of his journey, gave him to understand that his further stay in Spain was undesirable. Scouted by Spain as well as by France, he, on returning about the end of March to Paris, wrote to his father, proposing to offer for the hand of the Czarina Elizabeth of Russia, in order to secure as her marriage portion the 20,000 troops for his expedition! "She is of an adventurous character," so wrote the adventurous visionary, "and might like the idea."

The hare-brained conduct of Charles greatly disconcerted his sedate and circumspect brother, who, convinced of the folly of linking his fortunes with him, stole away to Rome, where he arranged with his father to secure for him a cardinal's hat. The news, as it well might, made Charles aghast. It was a worse blow to him than Culloden. He found it impossible to forgive his brother;

he also broke with his father; and his conviction of general ill-usage was greatly deepened. A second stunning blow soon also fell upon him by the conclusion of the treaty, 18th October 1748, of Aix-la-Chapelle, between England, France, and the United Provinces, which was signed on the 20th by Spain and later by other Powers. Such a treaty he deemed, in itself, a gross betrayal of his interests; and the provision in it for his removal from France added, in his opinion, palpable insult to injury. Encouraged by his mistress, the Princess de Talmond, and other female friends, and seduced by his own violent self-will, he determined on affronting Louis and his Ministers by the adoption of a defiant attitude; and he calmly assured the French Minister sent to remind him of the terms of the treaty, that a regard to the true interests of Louis prevented his compliance with it. An offer of Louis of a pension and a mansion at Fribourg in Switzerland merely caused him to seize by the arm the Minister of Foreign Affairs charged with the message and turn him out of the room. This being reported to Louis, he remarked: "Since the prince plays the madman, he must be treated like a madman"; and on 10th December he was seized at the doors of the opera, bound with silken cords, and, "like a roll of tobacco," bundled into a coach and driven to the fortress of Vincennes, whence a few days afterwards he was liberated on condition of leaving France.

On the 23rd he arrived at Avignon in the guise of an officer of the Royal Irish regiment of France. Then, shortly afterwards, he vanished from public view: from the limelight of notoriety he retired into complete obscurity, resolved, as he expressed it, to "take refuge in some hole in a rock" until he discovered a means of again appearing in the full effulgence of an armed champion of his dynasty. The resolve was taken partly under the stress of passionate indignation and wounded

pride. Rather than accept the public rôle of shadowy royalty he resolved to dissemble his identity. The old conventional monotonies of a sham court were a mere weariness to him; his adventurous experiences in Scotland had burned themselves into his brain; the fascination of his previous peril and excitements had taken possession of him; the romance of concealment, the joy of baffling detection, became to him almost a necessary of life; and the fashion of his existence became a repetition, under a sort of civilised conditions, of the old game of hide-and-seek in the Highland glens and mountains.

He did not respect the letter of his promise to leave France, though he was not an obtrusive visitor there or elsewhere. Shortly after leaving Avignon he went to Paris to arrange secretly about his correspondence and the receipt of money; and for some time he stayed in concealment with his mistress, the Princess de Talmond, in the Convent of St Joseph. In the autumn of 1750 he wrote for a new power of Regency from his father, who, while sending him the commission with pleasure, in the hope that it might soon be of use to him, also added: "Do not treat others as you do me by expecting friendship and favours from them, while you do all that is necessary to disgust them." With this commission he immediately set out on a secret visit to London, which he had previously purposed in vain to enter by force; but an attempt to induce the English Jacobites to raise 4000 men on his behalf proved quite fruitless. At this time he, according to his own statement, announced his adherence to the "religion of the Church of England"; and, according to another report, he was, in 1753, admitted to the Anglican communion in "the new church in the Strand." He was in London both in this year and 1761—when he is said to have witnessed the coronation of George III.—and probably also in 1754. His Catholicism had never been more than a

mere form. In Scotland, Lord Elcho remarked, his religion was still to seek; and in his talks with his attendants in his Highland seclusion he did not conceal his opinion that his grandfather had committed a fatal blunder in favouring Catholicism. But it was now vain for Charles to seek to undo what his grandfather had done; whatever chance he had of this, he had missed by his own rash impetuosity, and he was never to have another.

Henceforth the life of Charles was to be one of mere deterioration. Obsessed by the impossible task he had set himself, it became a mere torment and curse to him. Every fresh disappointment tended to sour his spirit, and probably also increased the hold which over-indulgence in stimulants already had over him. Many better men than he have been ruined by intemperance, and many, in happier circumstances than he, have succumbed to it. But drink, combined with the repeated frustration of his chief hopes, acting on a nature daring and adventurous but inordinately self-willed and lacking in discernment and judgment, brought into prominence all that was worst in him; exaggerated his egoistic self-regard, and transformed his adventurous hardihood into a tyrannous brutality towards all who were foolish enough to link their fortunes with his. His intrigues, conspiracies, contrivances, enterprises were many and various, but all more or less fantastic, chimerical, impossible. Unchecked by spies and traitors—and in Pickle the Spy he had, as the late Mr Lang has shown, a quite consummate specimen of the genus traitor—he might possibly have done a deal of mischief to friends and foes, but never an iota of good to the cause he had at heart.

The relations of Charles with the Princess de Talmond were broken off in 1751, but whether before this Miss Clementina Walkinshaw had joined him cannot

be determined. He met her in the house of her uncle, Sir Hugh Paterson of Bannockburn, when, according to Lord Elcho, she became his mistress; and there seems corroboration of this in the statement of hers that between 1745 and 1747 she was "undone." According to her daughter, Charles obtained from her in 1746 a promise to follow him "wherever Providence might lead him, if he failed in his attempt." For some time she was resident abroad in a convent; but they were living together in Flanders in 1751-2. Being meanwhile vowed to a disguised wandering life, he deemed Miss Walkinshaw the most fitting helpmeet he could select. In October 1753 she bore him a daughter, whose baptism on the 29th was registered at Liège as that of the daughter of D. Johnson and the noble dame Charlotte Pitt. That they should soon violently disagree was inevitable, since Charles, when things were going badly with him and when irritable from the reaction of his excesses, had so little command of himself as to seem "in some degree devoid of reason." They drank and were merry together, quarrelled and were reconciled by turns. A gentleman reports that in 1754, while he was in a common tavern in Paris, a bemused man and woman drove up in a cab and seated themselves at a table near him, when they immediately began to quarrel, the man addressing the woman as "*coquine*," and she replying, "Although a Prince, you are unworthy to be called a gentleman." The couple, it turned out, were Charles and Miss Walkinshaw. His father and others strove to induce Charles to sever the connection, it being represented that since she had a sister in the household of the Princess Dowager of Wales, she might communicate important secrets to her; but that she would do so Charles did not credit, and deeply resented the attempted interference in his domestic arrangements.

When, in 1760, the lady with her daughter took refuge from his ill-usage in the convent at Meaux, he wrote to the King of France, asking that orders should be given for her immediate return. Neither this request, nor one that at least his daughter—"who," he wrote, "was my only comfort in my misfortunes"—should be sent, was complied with, whereupon he announced his resolve to discontinue all intercourse with the French court and with his father until they were given up.

On the death of his father in 1766, Charles returned from obscurity and took up his residence in Rome; but found a new addition to what he deemed his wrongs in the refusal of the Pope to recognise his sovereignty. For more than a year he declined to be received by the Pope as a mere nobleman, but at last was persuaded by his brother to do homage to him as the Count of Albany. Ultimately he bethought of taking to himself a royal consort. The various steps of his progress towards this consummation cannot be fully traced; but in the end his purpose obtained the patronage of Louis XV.—who deemed it desirable to secure the perpetuity of the line—and to further it Charles proceeded to Paris. The Princess of Salm-Kynberg was thought of; but the young lady became quite distressed at the very idea of such a lover. Application was then made to the Princess of Stolberg, who was delighted to grant him her eldest daughter Louise, stipulating that the marriage should take place at their first meeting; and they were united at Macerata on 17th April 1772. It is possible that the young lady knew less of the character and reputation of her elderly and battered wooer than her mother did; but the prospect of becoming a titular queen and the possible mother of a race of sovereigns was the only motive for her eager assent. She was

charming, clever, unconventional, intellectual, ambitious, and keen for social distinction. It was, perhaps, unfortunate for both that Pope Clement XIV. declined in any fashion to recognise their royal rank. Charles therefore, in high dudgeon, retired to Florence, where his old habits reasserted their sway; and in the end his relations with his wife became no better than his previous ones with Miss Walkinshaw. For her matrimonial miseries the lady sought solace in a kind of Platonic friendship of a very fervent kind with the poet Alfieri; and after a drunken attack on her by Charles, to whom her superior airs were specially exasperating, she by a clever ruse escaped to the convent of the White Nuns, whence, with the Pope's permission, and at the instance of the Cardinal York, she was permitted to enter the Ursuline Convent in Rome, previously occupied by the Princess Sobieski. Later the Cardinal was enticed to permit her occupation of rooms in his palace of the Cancellaria, and for two years her companionship with Alfieri was openly resumed; but after an interview between the cardinal and Charles in 1783, the cardinal obtained from the Pope an order for Alfieri to withdraw from Rome within fifteen days, which he did on 4th May, leaving the Countess overcome with grief and humiliation. On 3rd April 1784 a separation from Charles was arranged, and in a few months she and Alfieri resumed their close companionship.

Forsaken by his wife, Charles now bethought him of his daughter, whom, on 30th March 1783, he formally legitimated, obtaining the registration of the deed by the Parliament of Paris, and created Duchess of Albany; and on the arrangement for a separation from his wife being completed, he, on 31st July 1784, sent for her to live with him. She was shrewd, energetic, scheming, and strong-willed. He

was now a partly helpless wreck; and whether on this account, or because she was his daughter, or by reason of certain qualities in herself that appealed to him, or her mingled ability to cajole and master him, he both became fondly attached to her and permitted her to guide and influence him as no one else had been able to do. She "did the honours," and "gave the word" at the banquets at Florence and at Rome, to which they removed in December 1785, Charles, though greatly decayed in mind and body, being evidently much gratified by her social success, and submitting tranquilly to her predominance. "She checked him," wrote Mrs Piozzi, "when he drank too much, or when he talked too much—Poor soul! Though one evening he called Mr Greathead up to him and said in good English, and in a loud though cracked voice, 'I will speak to my own subjects in my own way, *sare*. Ay, and I will soon speak to you, sir, in Westminster Hall.' The Duchess shrugged her shoulders."

Charles died at Rome, 31st January 1788. Royal obsequies at Rome being forbidden by the Pope, they were performed at Frascati, whence after the death of his brother the body was brought to be laid beside his father and brother in the crypt of St Peter's.

The Duchess of Albany not long after her father's death was attacked by a painful internal complaint, of which she died 17th November 1789. Her mother—who after the Revolution took refuge at Fribourg—survived till 1802. The Countess of Albany, on the death of Alfieri in 1803, attached herself to the artist Fabre. Her quasi-royal rank, aided by considerable social gifts, conferred a certain distinction on her salons in Paris and Florence. She survived until 29th January 1824. The story of the brothers Sobieski Stuart, that their father, Lieutenant Thomas Allan, was the

legitimate son of Charles Edward and the Princess of Stolberg, is quite incredible; nor is it likely that they were descended from him, though they may possibly have had some kind of royal Stewart descent.

The decadence of Charles Edward did not, during his lifetime, become known to the bulk of his Jacobite followers. In the *Lyon in Mourning* it is occasionally referred to, but in a mild, gentle, and hopeful fashion. Even non-Jacobite Scotland continued to cherish the memory of the luckless, handsome young adventurer of the '45 with a certain kindliness, and this all the more that Jacobite possibilities perished finally at Culloden. On the other hand, in Jacobite tradition his adventurous valour in what the fates had doomed to be a hopeless cause, and the romance of his perilous wanderings in the Highlands, won him a peculiarly fond regard. That the hopes of Jacobitism perished with him only added to the poignancy of the Jacobite sentiment associated with his memory, which continued to be celebrated with glowing ardour in many stirring Jacobite songs.

CHAPTER XX.

HENRY BENEDICT, CARDINAL YORK.

HENRY BENEDICT MARIA CLEMENT, Cardinal York, and known by the Jacobites as Henry IX., the second son of James Francis Edward and the Princess Sobieski, was born at the Muti Palace, Rome, about eleven o'clock of the forenoon of 5th March 1725. On being informed of the birth, Pope Benedict XIII. immediately arrived to offer his congratulations; and shortly afterwards the child, as Duke of York, was baptised by him in the private chapel of the palace. With a view of promoting the interests of the dynasty, James contemplated committing the child to the care of the King of Spain; but the project was violently opposed by Clementina. Ultimately he was placed under the charge of the same tutors and governors as his brother, who was more than four years his senior. Though a little quick-tempered, he was more tractable than Charles and more easy to teach. He was an affectionate and engaging boy, while Charles, though frank, was more self-centred and engrossed with amusements and sports. Like his brother, Henry was musical, but preferred singing to playing. At the Roman balls Henry was deemed the prettier and more accomplished dancer. Writing in 1734, his fond father also remarks—"As far as one can judge of a child of his age, he promises yet more than the Prince"; and it may be said that at least his dis-

position, character, and such abilities as he possessed bore a closer resemblance to those of his father. Though he manifested now and then the high-strung Sobieski traits, they did not seriously interfere with his success in life; if occasionally leading to acute differences between him and his father, they did not assert themselves so strongly nor so fatally in him as in his more energetic and wayward brother.

Most likely his father, who himself possessed a strong ecclesiastical bent, at an early date designed Henry for the Church; but until he reached manhood a definite decision could be postponed. Much might depend on the Jacobite prospects in Great Britain, which from 1740 began to assume a fictitious hopefulness. The visit of Charles to Paris in 1744 even made it likely that Henry would make his *début* in Britain in the character of a soldier. On learning of the adventurous voyage of Charles to Scotland in 1745, he could not refrain from setting out to Paris to find some means of rendering him assistance. As he was detained at Avignon for two months by illness, he did not reach Paris until the last week of October, by which time the news of his brother's sensational occupation of Edinburgh had startled Europe, and partially roused France from its lethargic attitude towards his adventure. After a rather reserved reception from Louis XV., he succeeded in obtaining the despatch of various ships with supplies of arms and ammunition; and it was also at last arranged that he should set out with the expedition designed to sail on Christmas Day from Dunkirk for the coast of Kent. After its abandonment he lingered on in Paris until he learned of the disaster at Culloden, when, indisposed to return to Rome until suspense as to his brother's fate was ended, he accompanied the French troops to Flanders and was present at the siege of Antwerp.

On receiving the joyful news from his brother of his safe arrival at Roscoff, he joined him at Paris. For some weeks they were on the best of terms with each other; but Henry could not coincide with the diplomatic methods by which Charles sought to hustle France into undertaking immediately a second expedition; while his manner of life and the character of his associates more and more harassed him. He himself neither liked Paris nor was he a favourite in Parisian society. Its hardly-veiled contempt for the ceremonial ecclesiasticism which absorbed so much of his time, shocked him more than its frivolity and immorality, for in the latter respect Rome was then almost the match of Paris; and, on the other hand, his scrupulous devotion to the forms of his faith made him out of place in the society he had to frequent. Shrewd enough also to perceive that Charles was merely ruining his cause by his impetuous impatience, he decided that it would be folly longer to subordinate his own aims and prospects to his. Shortly after Charles went on his secret mission to Spain, he therefore expressed to his father his desire to put into execution his purpose to enter the Church. To this by no means unexpected resolution his father gave his cordial approval, and shortly after the return of Charles to Paris, Henry, with the connivance of Cardinal Tencin, set out, on 29th April, secretly for Rome. Of the private ecclesiastical diplomacy connected with his sudden departure we know nothing, though his resolution had an opportune coincidence with the vacancy of a cardinal's hat. Again, if the decision of Henry was hastened by a desire to secure the hat, we may also infer that the Papal authorities, having concluded that there was now little hope of a Catholic Restoration in Britain, were of opinion that the Catholic cause there would be best served by the

prestige it might gain through the acceptance of a high Papal office by one of the exiled family. The self-willed conduct of Charles had also in the eyes of his father deprived him of any claim to be consulted about his brother's future. As his father in a quite surprisingly sarcastic fashion remarked to him in his letter of 13th June, announcing that in a few days Henry would be made cardinal—"Those who may have had their own views to remove us from your affairs have compassed their end. We are satisfied and you are master; so that there is no bone of contention remaining."

On 30th June 1747 Henry received the tonsure at the hands of the Pope in the private chapel of the Muti Palace; and on 3rd July he was in the Sistine Chapel solemnly created a cardinal-deacon of the title of Santa Maria in Campitello. Before the ceremony a difficulty arose on account of his claiming to wear ermine on his "cappa" in token of royalty, and consequently to take precedence of the other cardinals. To this they unanimously objected; and as a compromise, it was agreed that while his royal descent should not affect his ecclesiastical rank, and that on his coat of arms the tassellated hat should surmount the ducal coronet, he should have the title of *Altesse Royal et Eminentissime*. Meanwhile he had not taken priest's orders; and since Charles was unmarried, the Pope, it is said, was reluctant to grant them, lest "there may be occasion for his getting heirs to the crown of England." But punctilious as was Henry about his royal rank, he appears to have been so mainly from personal considerations and from the ecclesiastical importance it might confer on him. Having adopted an ecclesiastical career he was bent on making the most of it. He was resolved to have a full share of the wealth and of the pomp and glory to which a

Roman cardinal might aspire, and we may even suppose that visions of the chair of St Peter's were not absent from his imagination. Being as enamoured of the splendours of ecclesiastical Rome as Charles was of the secular glories of sovereignty, he was not prepared to sacrifice his ecclesiastical prospects to atone for the possible matrimonial negligence of his brother. Having received in August 1748 the orders of dean and sub-deacon, he was, on 1st September, ordained priest, and a little later was made arch-priest of the Basilica of the Vatican and prefect of the fabric of St Peter's. In 1752 he received the *commendam* of the Church of the Holy Apostles, with liberty to retain the *commendam* of Santa Maria in Campitello; and he was further complimented by the gift of various rich benefices from France and Spain.

Notwithstanding his cardinalship, Henry continued to reside with his father in the Muti Palace. This proved to be a not quite happy arrangement. James was interfering and querulous, and essayed to be a kind of ecclesiastical director to his son. He took objection to his absorption in musical rehearsals, his too intimate relations with his choirmaster, and the appointment of the Abbé John Lercari as his chamberlain.

The Sobieski excitability and contumacy which James had provoked in his wife now asserted themselves in his pattern younger son, and produced a kind of parody of the older scandal. The trivial causes of the dispute did not lessen its implacability. If it necessarily lacked some of the piquancy of the older one, it was for a time bitter enough; and since the cardinal, as his mother had done, in the end openly revolted from his father, it caused almost as great a sensation. Declining to brook his father's meddling interference with him, he withdrew to Bologna, only the Pope's reminder that as a cardinal he could not

continue to live there inducing him to return. Through the Pope's intervention a kind of reconciliation was patched up; but notwithstanding their fundamental affection and respect for each other, petty yet acute troubles now and again arose to disturb their harmony. Nor at this time was Henry quite a favourite either with the Pope or his fellow-cardinals. His abilities were somewhat limited, and he lacked the personal qualities that might have rendered unnecessary the superior airs by which he sought to insist on his royal rank.

On 18th November 1758, Henry was consecrated Archbishop of Corinth *in partibus infidelium*, and in the following February he exchanged his *commendam* of the Church of the Holy Apostles for that of the great Basilica of Santa Maria in Trastevere. Frascati, one of the six cardinal sees, having fallen vacant in 1761, he was made bishop of it on 13th July; and in 1763 he was appointed vice-chancellor of St Peter's, with the splendid palace of the Cancellaria as a residence. With his foreign and Roman livings he was now, perhaps, the wealthiest of the Roman ecclesiastics, and his great good fortunes improved him in geniality. He resided chiefly at his episcopal palace of La Rocca at Frascati in the wooded Alban hills, near the site of the ancient Tusculum. Here he passed a busy life of mingled ecclesiastical activity and semi-royal splendour. After the fashion of his time he was a model Roman prelate: punctilious in the observation of his daily routine of devotion, diligent in studying the fathers, and active in stately visits to the villages and convents, in superintending the labours of his clergy, in establishing schools and orphanages, and in providing out of his abundant means for the sick and the poor as they had never been provided for before. He loved to play the rôle of the great ecclesiastical prince, and made him-

self conspicuous by his costly banquets to distinguished visitors, his gorgeous lackeys, and his splendid chariots and steeds. In his frequent journeys to the neighbouring Rome he was drawn in a carriage with six horses, which, more from vanity than necessity, the postilions were ordered to whip up to their utmost speed. External pomp and glory counted for much with him, and he was also the mere slave of formulas and ceremonials; but his pomposity and formality did not interfere with his kind-heartedness and benevolence. If not very clever, he was on the whole well meaning; though by no means ascetic, he was, apart from his mild addiction to savoury dishes and his love of display, hardly voluptuous; and if not himself much of a scholar, he had a sincere respect for learning. He founded an important ecclesiastical seminary at Frascati, and formed a library containing many rare books, which were later added to from the royal library at Rome.

On the death of his father in 1766 the cardinal, zealous for the honour and glory of the dynasty, did his utmost, though in vain, to obtain Papal recognition of his unhappy brother's sovereignty, and he also strove, though equally in vain, to wean Charles from his intemperate habits. Knowing his brother as he did, it is unlikely that he would have prognosticated much good from his marriage, but he was not consulted about it; for in a letter to the Countess of Albany after her flight from Charles, he rather bluntly remarks—"I beg you to recall that I had no share whatever in bringing about your indissoluble union with my brother, beyond giving my formal assent to the marriage, of which I had received no private notice." It was, however, easy for him to credit that her life with Charles had become merely intolerable; and it was quite what might be expected of him to advise her to take refuge in a convent, in the hope that she would

lead what he deemed "a holy life." Still, a less conspicuous patronage of her would have been more proper in one who, according to his political tenets, was bound to regard Charles, notwithstanding his frailties, as his divinely appointed sovereign. He also without inquiry accepted her version of the story, and not only so, but when she became weary of the monotony of the "holy life" he had designed for her, he permitted her to occupy rooms in his palace of the Cancellaria. To have done so would have been injudicious, even had not the poet Alfieri, her rescuer, followed her to Rome, and made himself her almost daily companion. It is merely amazing that the cardinal should have been blind to the interpretation that Roman society would put on their relations until he was enlightened by an interview with Charles during his dangerous illness. If after this his opinion remained unchanged as to her marital wrongs, he now became aware that there was an element in the case which he had not hitherto recognised, and that she had been utilising him in a more or less compromising fashion.

The cardinal showed an equal lack of judgment in his reception of the intelligence—startling and disagreeable though it might be—that Charles had resolved to legitimate his daughter and bring her to live with him. True, the Walkinshaw connection was offensive to him from its close connection with the more unpleasant aspects of his brother's ill-guided career; but what specially rankled in his mind was the "pretended legitimization," which he was convinced—for he made no allowance for his brother's loneliness or his parental feelings—had no other intention than "putting a public slight" upon him and his sister-in-law. His prejudices against the lady began, however, to disappear when he learned how deftly she was managing her father, and how greatly

he was benefiting in spirits and conduct by her genial influence; and an interview with him at Perugia secured her his warm friendship and esteem, though he never, of course, could bring himself to recognise her "pretended legitimation."

On the death of Charles Edward, 31st January 1788, the cardinal, since royal honours were refused for the obsequies at Rome, resolved that they should be performed at Frascati, where, therefore, the body found temporary sepulchre. Ignoring also the legitimation of the Duchess of Albany, he, in announcing the death to the foreign courts, sent an assertion of his claims to succession to the sovereignty, which, he affirmed, were not invalidated by the sacred office of bishop which he held; and he further declared that, after his death, they would "pass in their full and unimpaired force to that Prince to whom they will lawfully revert by proximity of blood." Yet, "inasmuch," so he conceded, "as the critical position of our Royal House requires prudent measures, and We do not wish to embarrass Ourselves further, We intend of our own free will to retain the title of Duke of York (which will in reality be no longer our title) with all its adjuncts as we have hitherto done." The meaning of this circumlocution was that, being a cardinal and bishop, he was not permitted by the Papal authorities to assert his sovereign dignity in public. The Pope deemed his announcement quite satisfactory; but it is undeniable that Henry, in order to retain his ecclesiastical dignities, found it needful to do a certain despatch to his sovereignty. In his public and ecclesiastical capacity he had to submit to a kind of veiled majesty. While styling himself Henry, called the Duke of York, he, however, substituted the crown for the ducal coronet under the cardinal's hat, and unofficially he did what he could

to encircle himself with a kind of royal halo. Privately, and within the walls of his ecclesiastical palace, he assumed a kind of royal state: his royal rank was signified by the replacing of the ducal coronet by the crown on his plate and his seals; he exacted the honours of royalty from his household, and they were usually paid him by visitors. To mark his legitimate, though only nominal, accession, he also caused a medal to be struck, bearing on the obverse his portrait in profile and the inscription, "*Hen. IX. Mag. Brit. Fr. et Hib. Fid. Def. Card. Ep. Tusc.*"; and on the reverse a female figure clinging to a cross, with a lion and crown at her feet and St Peter's in the background, the inscription being, "*Non desiderii hominum sed voluntate Dei. An. MD.CC.LXXXVIII.*" Another medal bears on the one side the inscription, "*Henricus Nonus Magniae Britanniae Rex,*" and on the reverse, "*Non Voluntate Hominum sed Dei Gratia.*" Only one royal function did he, however, exercise: he was the last British sovereign, *de jure* or *de facto*, to touch for the king's evil.

The French Revolution, which brought such disaster to sovereignty, and did not a little to uproot the ancient notions as to the divine rights of kings, had also injurious consequences on the fortunes of the last member of the elder branch of the Stewart dynasty. To begin with, he lost his two rich French livings—the abbeys of St Austin and St Amand,—and the pension conferred on him by Spain was also discontinued. More evils were also soon in store for him, for the Revolution was followed by the predatory conquests of the terrible Napoleon. When, in 1796, Napoleon invaded Italy, the cardinal, to enable the Pope to raise the tribute demanded by the insatiable conqueror, disposed of or pledged the greater part of the family jewels and heirlooms, including the Sobieski ruby, valued at

£50,000. This was also but the commencement of his calamities. In 1798 the troops of Napoleon not only entered Rome, but took possession of the Pope; and to escape a similar fate the cardinal fled to Naples, where he and other cardinals found refuge at the court until the defeat of the Neapolitan troops compelled them to set sail for Messina. Thence, after a stormy passage which caused them to put in at Corfu, they finally reached Trieste, from which they crossed over to Venice. During the voyage the cardinal received an abrasion of the leg, which caused an open sore during the remainder of his life. At Venice his poverty compelled him to seek lodgings in an obscure house on the Rialto; and when the money obtained from some jewels and family plate he had brought with him became exhausted, he took refuge in a neighbouring convent before proceeding to join the other cardinals at Padua.

If not at his direct suggestion, it was probably after consultation with him that Cardinal Borgia, on 14th September 1799, made known the destitution of the Cardinal York to Sir John Hipposley, who for some time had been the veiled representative of English interests at the Vatican; and at the instance of George III. he received from the English Government an annuity of £4000. Distressful, if not desperate, as were his circumstances, to have recourse for succour to him whom he deemed his rival on the British throne might seem rather servile; but he is supposed to have been reconciled to it by the consideration that his grandmother's annuity had not been paid; and, of course, he might also be of opinion that as her legitimate king he had claims on Britain for at least as much as would enable him to spend his last years in comparative comfort. Accustomed to luxurious splendour, his reduction to utter poverty must have been a terribly hard experi-

ence, and its possible continuance a calamity almost worse than death. Immensely relieved, therefore, by the prospect of at least moderate affluence, he in cordial, yet guardedly self-respectful, terms expressed to Lord Minto, British Ambassador at Venice, his gratification at the "noble way of thinking of your generous and beneficent sovereign."

The capitulation of Rome to the English fleet enabled the cardinal in 1800 to return to Frascati, where with the annuity from England, added to what sources of income were left him, he revived in a partial form the old splendours. In 1803 he was elevated to the bishopric of Ostia and Velletri and made dean of the Sacred College; but in consideration of his age and infirmities he was permitted by the Pope to reside at Frascati. He died there on 13th July 1807 in his eighty-third year. He had thus attained to a greater age than any other member of the dynasty: his father died in his seventy-seventh year; but of the others only James VII. attained to over sixty; and the majority, including Mary, died before attaining forty-five, the most of these not attaining forty. No fewer than six died a violent death, and three died in exile.

On 16th July the body of the cardinal, after lying in state in the Cancellaria, was placed in the crypt of St Peter's, where, with the co-operation of George IV. and Pope Pius VII., a sculptured monument by Canova in white marble was erected, with half-length portraits in mezzo-relievo of the three last members of the dynasty. In accordance with directions in the cardinal's will, his executor presented the Prince Regent (afterwards George IV.) with a cross of St Andrew worn by Charles I. and an ancient ring worn by the cardinal—both forming a part of the crown jewels which James II. and VII. took with him to France. In his will he renewed his protest as to the rights of the succession,

and transferred them to the next legitimate heir "with the most express and solemn forms." The heir at the time of the cardinal's death was the ex-King Charles Emanuel IV. of Sardinia, descended from Henrietta Stewart, Duchess of Orleans, the daughter of Charles I. and the favourite sister of Charles II. The elder branch of this line is now merged in the royal line of Bavaria, and a younger branch is represented by the Dukes of Parma.

The life of Henry Benedict contrasted with that of his father and brother in being free from the harassing care of an endeavour to achieve an impossible task. He was able to accomplish his main aims in life,—to discover a vocation which suited his predilections and conferred on him perfect happiness and content. His conviction in regard to his sovereignty did not prove to be to him the incessant perplexity it was to his father or the curse it was to his brother. While it was to him practically little more than a pious opinion, it was nevertheless even a source of deep gratification, and added not a little to his felicity. By the time he fell heir to the nominal sovereignty the legitimist controversy had ceased to affect practical politics. The old political and ecclesiastical contentions which had played so great a part in moulding the fortunes of the Stewarts had lost much of their ancient vitality and virulence. The constitutional difficulty had been largely solved by the gradual processes of time, and a new era of more enlightened tolerance had also begun to dawn. Henry Benedict, the last of the exiled dynasty, survived merely as a kind of relic of a past that was "all by death possessed." There was also a certain sad appropriateness in the decree of fate that the last of the old line should die a cardinal. It was the devotion of the exiled dynasty to Catholicism that had made their exercise of sovereignty in Britain an impossibility; and

Henry Benedict virtually permitted his Catholicism to absorb even his nominal sovereignty. To him his great ecclesiastical vocation proved almost a sufficient solace for his inability to exercise his sovereign rights, but it meant the final completion of the sacrifice of the sovereignty of the older line on the altar of Catholicism.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.

THE Scottish aspect of the Stewart reigns is treated with special fulness and careful citation of documents in P. F. Tytler's *Hist. of Scotland from the Accession of Alexander III. to the Union*, 9 vols., 1828-43, and later edns. J. Hill Burton's *Hist.*, extending to the "last Jacobite insurrection," revised edn., 8 vols., 1873, and later edns., is less minute, but has some later information. Corrections and additions from new sources are included in Professor Hume Brown's *Hist.* (Cambridge Hist. Ser.), new ill. edn., 3 vols., 1910; and the more elaborate *Hist.* by Andrew Lang, 4 vols., 1900-7, whose attitude towards Kirk and Covenanting politics is less favourable than that of Professor Hume Brown. A critical attitude is also that in W. Law Mathieson's *Politics and Religion in Scotl.* (1550-1695), 2 vols., 1902, and *Scotl. and the Union* (1695-1747), 1905. See also R. S. Rait's *Outline of the Relations between Scotl. and Engl.* (500-1707), 1901; and, for the Stewart relations with France down to the end of the eighteenth century, Francisque-Michel's *Les Écossais en France, les Français en Écosse*, 2 vols., 1862.

General works on the Stewarts include: G. Crawford's *Genealogical Hist. of the Royal Family of the Stewarts* (1034-1710), 1710; A. Stuart's *Genealogical Hist. of the Stewarts*, 1790 (for the earlier Stewarts and the various junior branches); Townend's *Descendants of the Stewarts*, 1858; P. M. Thornton's *Stuart Dynasty* (1124-1716), 1890; *The Story of the Stewarts*, printed for the Stewart Society, 1901; G. H. Johnstone's *Heraldry of the Stewarts*, 1908; and W. G. B. Murdoch's *The Royal Stuarts in their connection with Art and Letters*, 1908. Information establishing the Breton origin of the family has been contributed by A. Stuart (1790), G. Chalmers (*Caledonia*,

1807), Eyton (*Hist. of Shropshire*, 1850), and J. H. Round (*Peerage and Family Hist.*, 1901), who has conclusively disposed of certain philological speculations of Dr Hewison (*Bute in the Olden Time*, 1888). On the legitimacy of the Royal Stewart line, see R. A. Hay's *Vindication*, 1723, and J. Gordon's *Dissertation*, 1759 (both in *Scotia Rediviva*, 1826); Sir W. Mure's *Family of Rowallane*, 1825; Riddell's *Legal Tracts*, 1835, and *Stewartia*, 1843; Theiner's *Vetusta Monumenta*, 1864; and Burnet's Preface to the *Exchequer Rolls*, vol. iv., 1880.

The chief original sources for the earlier Stewarts are: Wyntoun's *Chronicle* (to 1408); Barbour's *Bruce*; Froissart's *Chroniques* (1307-1400), various edns. and translations; Fordun's *Chronica* (to 1385), latest edn. by Skene, 1871-2; *Melrose Chronicle* (731-1275), various edns.; *The Scala Chronica* (to 1363) of Sir Thomas Gray, ed. Stevenson, Maitl. Club, 1836, trans. by Sir H. E. Maxwell, 1907; *Chron. of Lanercost* (1291-1346), ed. Stevenson, 1836, trans. by Sir H. E. Maxwell (1272-1346), 1913; *Chron. of Man*, ed. P. E. Munch, 1860; *Chron. of the Picts and Scots*, &c., ed. Skene, 1867; Hemingford's *Chron.* (1048-1340), ed. Hamilton, 1848; *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa* (1150-1406), ed. Bond, 1866-8; and the *Chronica Monast. S. Albani* (Walsingham, Rishanger, &c., 1259-1422), ed. Riley, 1863-76. For supplementary or corrective information see *Documents ill. of the Hist. of Scotl.* (1286-1306), ed. Stevenson, 2 vols., 1870; and for both the earlier and later Stewart reigns, *Cal. Docs. relating to Scotl.* (1108-1509), ed. Bain, 4 vols., 1881-8; *Acts of Scott. Parlt.* (from 1124); Rymer's *Fœdera* (from 1100); Anderson's *Cal. of the Laing Charters*, 1899; *Rotuli Scotiæ* (1291-1516), 2 vols., 1814-19; Theiner's *Vet. Mon.* (1216-1547), 1864; *Cal. Venetian Papers* (from 1202); *Reg. of the Great Seal* (from 1306) and *Exchequer Rolls* (from 1264). Special works are: Hector Boece's *Hist.* (to the death of James III.), 1527, trans. by J. Bellenden, 1536 (very readable, but partly fabulous); Lord Hailes' *Annals* (1057-1370), 3 vols., 1819; J. Pinkerton's *Hist.* (1371-1542), 2 vols., 1797; Cosmo Innes's *Scotl. in the Middle Ages*, 1860; E. W. Robertson's *Scotl. under her Early Kings*, 2 vols., 1862; W. Burns's *Scottish War of Independence*, 2 vols., 1873; and Sir H. E. Maxwell's *Robert the Bruce*, 1897, and *Making of Scotland*, 1911.

For the successive five kings of the name of James, see, in

addition to some of the Calendars and Chronicles mentioned above, Bower's *Continuation of Fordun* (to 1425); Hardyng's *Chron.* (to 1461), ed. Ellis, 1812; and John de Waurin's *Chron.* (1399-1471), ed. Hardy, 1884-91. The contemporary account of the death of James I., first published in Pinkerton's *Hist.*, and more correctly by the Maitl. Club, 1837, is of doubtful value as regards details. Bishop Leslie's *Vernacular Hist.*, Ban. Club, 1839, includes from the beginning of the reign of James I. to 1561; but neither it nor his *Latin Hist.*, nor the histories of Boece, Buchanan, or Major, are of independent value for the earlier period. For this and subsequent sovereigns, see Sir W. Fraser's *Red Book of Menteith*, 2 vols., 1880; and his *Douglas Book*, 4 vols., 1885. D. Hume of Godscroft's *Hist. of the House of Douglas*, 1644, is biassed, but contains some special information. For the ecclesiastical aspect of the reigns, Keith's *Catalogue of Scottish Bishops* (1st edn., 1655, ed. Russell, 1824, and included in J. F. S. Gordon's *Eccles. Chron. of Scotl.*, 1867), is superseded by Bishop Dowden's *Bishops of Scotland*, 1913. For the reigns of the later Jameses, Hannay and Herkless's *Archbishops of St Andrews*, 4 vols., 1907-13, is invaluable.

For the poetry of James I., see J. J. Jusserand's *Le Romans du un roi d'Écosse*, 1895, trans. 1896; and article by him in *Revue Hist.*, vol. lxiv.; edns. of *The Kingis Quair*, by Prof. Skeat, Scot. Text Soc., 1884 and 1912; Prof. Lawson's *Kingis Quair* and *The Quair of Jelusy*, 1910; J. T. T. Brown's *Authorship*, &c., 1896; R. S. Rait's *The Kingis Quair and the New Criticism*, 1898; T. F. Henderson's *Scott. Vernac. Lit.*, 3rd edn., 1910; and J. H. Millar's *Lit. Hist. of Scotl.*, 1903.

For James II. we have the short *Auchinleck Chron.*, privately printed, 1818, which has a strong Douglas bias; and with this reign begins also Lyndsay of Pittscottie's *Chron.*, which is continued to 1565. For the early period it is largely founded on tradition and, apparently, ballads; for the later periods, although here also more graphic than minutely trustworthy, he had information from older contemporaries. For the relations with England in this and later reigns, see also *The Paston Letters* (1422-1509), various edns.

For James III. there is the continuation of Boece by Ferrerius, who had some contemporary information. Buchanan, Leslie, and Major begin also to have more independent value. For this and subsequent reigns we have *The Lord High Treasurer's*

Accounts (from 1473); and the *Cals. of Venetian* and of *Spanish State Papers* (from 1485) become increasingly important for subsequent reigns, including those of Mary and James VI. See also for James III.-IV., *Letters and Papers ill. of the Reigns of Richard III. and Henry VII.*, ed. Gairdner, 1861-3.

Important letters of James IV.-V. are included in Ruddiman's *Epist. Regum Scotorum* (1505-1545), 2 vols., 1722-4. Much important new light on the relations of both kings with Henry VIII. is supplied by the *Cal. State Papers, Henry VIII.*, ed. Brewer and Gairdner, as also by the *Spanish Calendar*. The *Chronicles of Polydore Vergil* and Edmund Hall supply details that must be consulted with caution; and from the reign of James IV. we have the graphic if not quite reliable guidance of Knox's *Hist. of the Reformation*. Various social characteristics of the court of James IV. are mirrored in W. Dunbar's *Poems*; and in the Scott. Text Society's ed. (1884-93), is a valuable note by Sheriff Mackay on his relations with Denmark. Various original authorities for Flodden are given in C. J. Bates's *Flodden Field*, 1894; and rival theories about the battle are set forth in Col. Elliot's *Battle of Flodden*, 1911. Modern accounts of James IV. are those by Prof. Greg. Smith, 1890, Stair-Kerr, 1912, and I. A. Taylor, 1913.

For James V. and subsequent reigns we have *Diurnal of Occurrents* (1573-75), Ban. Club, 1833; *Cal. Hamilton Papers* (1532-90), ed. Bain, 2 vols., 1890-92; and Teulet's *Relations Politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Écosse* (1515-60), 5 vols., 1862. See also Edmund Bapst's *Les Mariages de Jacques V.*, 1889.

For the earlier years of Mary in Scotland, in addition to certain authorities quoted above, see *Register of the Privy Council of Scotl.* (from 1545), which is also invaluable as regards the relations of subsequent sovereigns with Scotl.; *Cal. State Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots* (from 1547); and *Correspondance Politique d'Odet de Selve*, 1888. For the French episode, see Guiffry's *Lettres de Dianne de Poytiers*; Brantôme's *Mémoires* and Castelnau's *Mémoires*; Cheruel's *Marie Stuart et Catherine de Medicis*, 1858; Stevenson's *Mary Stuart* (1st eighteen years), 1886; De Ruble's *La Première Jeunesse de Marie Stuart*, 1891; and Jane T. Stoddart's *Girlhood of Mary Queen of Scots*, 1908. Very important are her

own *Lettres*, ed. Labanoff, 7 vols., 1844; also a selection translated by Miss Strickland, 2 vols., 1842, 2nd edn. 1862. For others, see reports of Hist. MSS. Comm. For her relations with Elizabeth, &c., in addition to the *Cals. of Scott. Papers*, see also *Cal. Engl. State Papers, For. Ser.*; and for foreign corresp., see, besides Teulet's *Relations* and the Venetian and Spanish State Papers, Baschet's *Diplomatie Vénétien*, 1862; *Corresp. de Fénelon* (1568-75), ed. Cooper and Teulet, 7 vols., 1838-40; *Corresp. de Cardinal de Granvelle* (1565-1586), 12 vols., 1877-96; *Relations Politiques des Pays Bas et d'Angleterre*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, 11 vols., 1882-1900; *Lettres de Catherine de Medici* (1533-88), 9 vols., 1880-1901; and J. H. Pollen's *Papal Negotiations*, Scott. Hist. Soc., 1901. Various documents are included in appendices to the histories of Keith, Laing, Robertson, and Tytler; and in Anderson's *Collections*, 4 vols., 1727-8; Hardwicke's *State Papers* (1501-1726), 8 vols., 1778; Haynes' *State Papers* (1542-70), 1740. See also Ellis's *Original Letters* (for this and subsequent reigns), 10 vols., 1824-46; *Illustrations of the Reign of Mary*, ed. Stevenson, Maitl. Club, 1837; Wright's *Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols., 1838; and *Bowes Corresp.*, Surtees Soc., 1842. The Lennox MSS. (in Cambridge University) are of special importance for the death of Darnley. For a pretty complete list of the earlier works on Mary, see *Bibliography* (1544-1700), by John Scott, C.B., 1896. Various contemporary pamphlets are published in Jebb's *De Vita et Rebus*, 2 vols., 1725. The chief contemporary works are the strongly adverse history of Knox; the history and vituperative pamphlets of Buchanan; the defensive pamphlets of Bishop Leslie; the *Hist. of Mary Queen of Scots*, by her secretary Claude Nau (probably partly inspired by her), ed. Stevenson, 1883; Birrel's *Diary* (1539-1605), 1798; Sir James Melville's *Memoirs* (1549-93), Ban. Club, 1833; Richard Bannatyne's *Memorials* (1569-1573), Ban. Club, 1836; *Hist. of James the Sext*, Ban. Club, 1825; and Lord Herries's *Memoirs*, Abbotsford Club, 1836 (not by the contemporary lord, but founded on contemporary ancestral information). Amongst the modern lives, &c., now largely discounted by later information, are Walter Goodal's *Examination*, 2 vols., 1744; William Tytler's *Inquiry*, 1750; Whitaker's *Mary Queen of Scots*, 3 vols., 1788; Chalmers's *Life*, 3 vols., 1822; Bell's *Life*, 1840, 1889; Hosack's *Mary Stuart and her Accusers*, 1868, 2nd edn.,

2 vols., 1871-4, and *Mary Stuart*, 1888; and Sir John Skelton's *Impeachment of Mary Stuart*, 1876, and *Maitland of Lethington*, 2 vols., 1887-8. The case for the genuineness of the Casket Letters was very ably put by M. Laing in a preliminary dissertation to his *Hist. of Scotl.* (1603-1709), 4 vols., 1819; and on the later phases of the Casket controversy, see Bresslau in *Historisches Taschenbuch* for 1822; Sepp's *Die Kassettenbriefe*, 1884, and *Der Original-Text*, 1888; Gerde's *Geschichte der Königen Maria Stuart*, 1885; T. F. Henderson's *Casket Letters*, 2nd edn., 1890, *Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. ii., 1905, App., and *Casket Letters* in vol. v. of *Scot. Hist. Review* (Jan. 1908); M. Philippson's *Études* in *Revue Hist.*, 1888 and 1889, privately printed 1889; And. Lang in *Mystery of Mary Stuart*, 1901, revised edn., 1904, in vol. v. of *Scot. Hist. Review* (Oct. 1907), and in *Encyc. Brit.*, 10th edn. Among modern lives are those by Dargaud, 1850; Mignet, 1851, and later edns. [elaborate and minute]; M. Philippson [*Histoire du Regne*], 3 vols., 1891-2; D. Hay Fleming, vol. i., 1897; R. S. Rait (extracts from contemporary writers), 1899; Sir J. Skelton (Goupil Ser.), 1903; A. H. Millar, 1904; T. F. Henderson, 2 vols., 1905; F. A. Macgunn, 1905; and Lady C. Blennerhasset, 1907. See also J. A. Froude's *Hist. of Engl.* [eloquent but strongly biassed]; E. Russell's *Maitland of Lethington*, 1912; Sainte-Beuve in *Galerie de Femmes Célèbres*; and A. C. Swinburne in 9th and 10th eds. of *Encyc. Brit.* Among miscellaneous works are *Inventaires* (1556-69), 1863; J. Stuart's *Lost Chapter*, 1874; De Gray Birch's *Original Documents relating to Sheffield*, 1874; A. Poulet's *Letter Books*, ed. Morris, 1874; Leader's *Mary Queen of Scots in Captivity*, 1880; Cuthbert Bede's *Fotheringay*, 1886; Sharman's *Library*, 1889; Hon. Mrs Maxwell Scott's *Tragedy of Fotheringay*, 1895, 2nd edn., 1905; M. A. S. Hume's *Love Affairs*, 1903; S. Cowan's *Last Days*, 1907; *Poems and Essays*, ed. Mrs Arbuthnot, 1909; and *Bardon Papers*, ed. Conyers Read, 1909. Recent books on the portraits are J. J. Foster's *True Portraiture*, 1901; L. Cust's *Notes on Authentic Portraits*, 1903; L. Forrers' *Porträts auf München*, 1906, and A. Lang's *Portraits and Jewels*, 1907.

For James VI., in addition to Calendars, &c., already mentioned, see those under his reign and those of Elizabeth, and the reports of the Hist. MSS. Comm. There are a few letters of

interest in the Laing Coll. of the Edinburgh University Library, and in the British Museum. Some of the important letters and documents in the Advocates' Library are published in Maidment's *Analecta Scotica*, 2 vols., 1834-7. See also Rushworth's *Hist. Collections*, 1703-8; Murrin's *State Papers* (1571-96), 1740; *Despatches of M. Courcelles* (1586-7), Ban. Club., 1828; *Papers relating to the Marriage of James VI.*, Ban. Club., 1828; *Papers of Patrick Master of Gray*, Ban. Club., 1836; *Melrose State Papers*, Abbotsf. Club., 1837; *Letters and State Papers*, Abbotsf. Club., 1838; *Egerton Papers*, 1840; *Letters of Eliz. and James VI.* (1582-1603), 1849; Wotton's *Letters and Despatches* (1617-20), 1850; *Original Letters on Eccles. Affairs in Scotl.*, Ban. Club., 1851; *Corresp. of James VI. and Cecil*, Camden Soc., 1861; *Letters* (1618-20), ed. S. R. Gardiner, 1 and 2 ser., 1865-8; *Fortescue Papers* (1611-25), ed. Gardiner, 1871; and *Docs. illustrating Catholic Policy*, ed. T. G. Law in *Scot. Hist. Misc.*, vol. i., 1893. For his Scottish reign contemporary authorities, besides those mentioned under Mary, are James Melville's *Diary* (1555-1601), Ban. Club., 1836 [some graphic details]; D. Moysie's *Memoirs* (1577-1603), Maitl. Club., 1830; D. Calderwood's *Hist. of the Kirk of Scotl.* (1514-1625), 8 vols., 1842-4 [strongly Presbyterian]; and Spottiswoode's *Hist. of the Church of Scotl.* (1203-1625), 3 vols., 1847-51 [favours James]. For his Irish policy see *Cal. S. P. relating to Ireland* (1603-1625), 5 vols. 1872-80; *Carew MSS.* (1515-1624), 6 vols., 1867-73; G. Hill's *Plantation of Ulster* (1608-20), 1877; R. Bagwell's *Ireland under the Stewarts* (1603-60), 2 vols., 1900; and T. D. Ingram, *Critical Examination*, 1900. Among contemporary English authorities are Camden's *Annals*, various edns.; Goodman's *Court of James I.*, ed. Brewer, 2 vols., 1839; T. Osborne's *Memoirs*, 1658; A. Weldon's *Court and Character*, 1650, and later edns.; R. Coke's *Detection* (1603-1714), 3 vols., 1719; Winwood's *Memorials* (1596-1613), 3 vols., 1725; Welwood's *Memoirs* (1588-1688), 1736; *Secret Hist.*, ed. Sir Walter Scott, 2 vols., 1811; W. Yonge's *Diary* (1603-1714), 3 vols., 1719; and R. Wilbraham's *Journal* (1593-1616), 1902. The standard modern histories are those of Lingard, Hallam, Ranke, and S. R. Gardiner. Speddings' *Life and Letters of Bacon* is of prime importance. See also G. W. Prothero's *Select Statutes* (1559-1625), 1894, and later edns.; J. R. Seeley's *Growth of British Policy* (16c.-1714), 2 vols., 1895; T. Carlyle's *Hist.*

Sketch (1603-40), 1898; G. M. Trevelyan's *Engl. under the Stuarts*, 1904, and later edns.; *Pol. Hist. of Engl.*, ed. Hunt and Lane-Poole, vol. ix. (1603-60), by F. C. Montague, 1907; and J. Mackinnon's *Hist. of Modern Liberty*, vol. iii., 1908. Among biographies are those by W. Harris, 1753; I. Disraeli, 1816; L. Aikin, 2 vols., 1822; R. Chambers, 2 vols., 1830; and T. F. Henderson (Goupil Ser.), 1904. Miscellaneous works include J. Nichol's *Progresses*, 1828; T. Birch's *Court and Times*, 1848, and *Memoirs of Queen Eliz.*, 1752; *Hist. View of Negotiations between Eng., Fr., and Brussels* (1592-1617), 1749; J. Gerard's *What was the Gunpowder Plot?* 1897; S. R. Gardiner's *What the G. P. was*, 1907; H. H. Spink's *The Gunpowder Plot*, 1902; Gardiner's *Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage* (1617-23), 2 vols., 1869; Earl of Bristol's *Defence of Negotiations with Spain* (1624), 1871; L. A. Barbé's *Tragedy of Gowrie House*, 1887; A. Lang's *James VI. and the Gowrie Conspiracy*, 1902; A. O. Meyer's *Clemens VIII. und Jakob I. von England*, 1904; Mary Sullivan's *Court Masques of James I.*, 1913; and *Stuart Tracts* (1603-93), ed. C. H. Frith, 1903.

For Charles I. the most important MSS. collections are those in the British Museum, the Record Office, the Clarendon, Carte, and Tanner MSS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the Balcarres and other collections in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh. See also reports of the Hist. MSS. Comm. The State Papers in the Record Office have been calendared. Selections from the Clarendon MSS. are included in the *Clar. State Papers*, 1757. See also *Cal. Clar. State Papers* (1523-1657), 3 vols., 1869-76. Portions of the Tanner MSS. are printed in Cary's *Memorials of the Civil War*, 2 vols., 1842, and of the Carte MSS. in Carte's *Original Letters*, 1744, and his *Life of Ormonde*, 2 vols., 1739. Published documents include T. Nalson's *Collection* (1639-49), 2 vols., 1682, and *Trial of Charles I.*, 1740; Thurloe's *State Papers* (1638-59), 7 vols., 1742; Bromley's *Royal Letters* (1619-65), 1787; *Verney Papers* (1640-2), 1845; *Farrington Papers* (1638-49), 1855; *Charles I. in 1646*, Camden Soc., 1856; *Pythouse Papers* (1643-80), 1879; *Hamilton Papers* (1638-50), Camden Soc., 1880, and addenda 1893; *Secret Negotiations* (1643-4), 1883; *Nicholas Papers* (1641-52), Camden Soc., 1886; *Documents illustrative of the Impeachment of Buckingham*, ed. Gardiner,

1889; *Clarke Papers* (1647-60), ed. Frith, Scot. Hist. Soc., 4 vols., 1891-1901; *Civil War Papers*, ed. H. T. Morland Simpson, Scot. Hist. Soc., 1893; and *Monteruel Corresp.* (1645-8), ed. Fotheringham, Scot. Hist. Soc., 2 vols., 1898-9. Scottish contemporary works include Bishop Guthrie's *Memoirs* (1637-49), 1748; Sir James Balfour's *Works*, vols. ii.-iv., 1829; Spalding's *Hist. of the Troubles* (1624-5), Spald. Club, 2 vols., 1828-9; Gordon's *Scots Affairs* (1837-41), Spald. Club, 3 vols., 1841; Rothe's *Relation* (1637-8), Ban. Club, 1839; R. Baillie's *Letters and Journals* (1637-1642), Ban. Club, 3 vols., 1841-2; *Ancrum Corresp.* (1616-1667), ed. Laing, 2 vols., 1875; Wishart's *Memorials of Montrose* (1639-1650), ed. Simpson and Murdoch, 1893; and *Johnston of Warriston's Diary* (1639-40), ed. Paul, Scot. Hist. Soc., 1896. See also J. K. Hewison's *Covenanters*, 1908. Of those relating to England, mention must first be made of Clarendon's classic *Hist.* (1625-1660), best edn., by Macray, 6 vols., 1888. Others are T. May's *Hist. of the Long Parliament*, 1647; D. Holles' *Memoirs* (1641-48), 1669, reprinted in Maseres' *Select Tracts*, q.v.; Hacket's *Life of Williams*, 1693; Sir T. Herbert's *Memoirs of the Last Two Years*, 1702—with, in the edn. of 1813, a letter relating to the interment of the king; R. Bulstrode's *Memoirs* (1610-1711), 1721; *Memoirs of Robert Carey, Earl of Monmouth*, ed. Sir W. Scott, 1811; Cary's *Memorials of the Civil War* (1646-52), 2 vols., 1842; *Court and Times of Charles I.*, 2 vols., 1848; *Fairfax Corresp.*, ed. Johnson and Bell, 4 vols., 1848-9; Ludlow's *Memoirs* (1620-92), 3 vols., 1698-9, ed. Frith, 1894; Verney's *Notes on the Long Parliament*, ed. Bruce, Camden Soc., 1845; Lord Herbert's *Expedition to the Isle of Rhè*, 1860; *Life of Col. Hutchinson*, new edn., 1885; *Lives of the Duke and Duchess of Newcastle*, ed. Frith, 1886; Heylin's *Life of Laud*, 1668, and later edns.; *Laud's Works*, 7 vols., 1847-60; Hobbes's *Behemoth*, ed. Tönnies, 1889; *Secret Hist. of Court and Times of Charles I.*, 1811; Sprigges' *Anglia*, 1647, new edn. 1854; Strafford's *Letters and Despatches*, 2 vols., 1739; Symond's *Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army* (1644-5), 1859; Somers' *Tracts*; Maseres' *Select Tracts* and the Civil War Tracts in the British Museum. In addition to the histories, &c., mentioned under James I. and VI., that of Guizot is of importance. See also Carlyle's *Cromwell*; Masson's *Life of Milton*; *Cambridge Mod. Hist.*, vol. v., 1904;

Forster's *Debates on the Grand Remonstrance*, 1860, *Quest of the Five Members*, 1860, and *Life of Eliot*, 2 vols., 1864; C. Markham's *Life of Fairfax*, 1876; Marriot's *Life and Times of Falkland*, 1907; Money's *Battles of Newbury* (1643-6), 1884; Godwin's *Civil War in Hants* (1642-5), 1882, 2nd edn., 1904; G. Hillier's *Nar. of Escape* (1647-8), 1882; A. O. Meyer's *Charles I. and Rome in Amer. Hist. Review* for October 1913; and Phillips' *Picture Gallery of Charles I.*, 1896. For his Irish policy, &c., see, in addition to the works by Bagwell and Ingram already mentioned, *Cal. Irish State Papers*, M. A. Hickson's *Ireland* (1641-2), 2 vols., 1884; and J. T. Gilbert's *Contemporary Hist.* (1641-52), 3 vols., 1879-80. Biographies include those by W. Harris, 1758, I. Disraeli, 5 vols., 1828-30, L. Aiken, 1833, E. B. Chancellor, 1886, and J. Skelton (Goupil Ser.), 1898.

For Charles II., in addition to Cals. of State Papers, Reports of Hist. MSS. Commission, and various collections referred to under Charles I. [compare dates], see *Secret Services of Charles II. and James II.*, Camden Soc., 1857; *Letters of the Earl of Arlington* (1662-6), 1701 and (1672-3) 1702; Fanshawe's *Letters during the Embassy to Spain* (1664-5), 1702; French and English Papers, in Sir J. Dalrymple's *Memoirs* (1681-1702), 1790; *Hatton Corresp.*, Camden Soc., 2 vols., 1878; Rushworth's *Hist. Collections* (1659-1701), 6 vols., 1703-8; *Saville Corresp.*, Camden Soc., 1858; *Sidney Corresp.*, 2 vols., 1843; Macpherson's *Original Paper* (1660-1714), 1775; *Despatches of Perwich* (1669-77), 1903; O. von Schwerin's *Briefe aus England* (1671-8), 1837; Sir William Temple's *Letters in Works*, 1770; and *Letters of Sir Joseph Williamson*, Camden Soc., 2 vols., 1871. For Scottish relations see, in addition to works mentioned under Charles I., *Lauderdale Papers*, ed. Airy, Camden Soc., 3 vols., 1884-6; *Lauderdale's Correspondence with Sharp and the Masterton Papers* (1660-1719) in *Miscell. Scot. Hist. Soc.*, 1893 [there is add. Lauderdale Corresp. in the Laing Collection in the University of Edinburgh]; *Letters and Papers addressed to George, Earl of Aberdeen* (1681-86), 1851; *Letters and Papers* (1650), ed. S. R. Gardiner, Scot. Hist. Soc., 1893; *Lauder of Fountainhall's Chron. Notes* (1680-1701), 1882; *Hist. Notices* (1661-88), 2 vols., 1848, and *Journals* (1665-76), 1900; *Law's Memorials* (1638-1684), 1818; G. Mackenzie's *Memoirs* (1660-77), 1821; Nicoll's *Diary* (1650-

1667, Ban. Club, 1836; Nimmo's *Narrative* (1654-1709), Scot. Hist. Soc., 1889; and Sir James Turner's *Memoirs* (1632-70), 1829. For Ireland, in addition to works previously mentioned, see *Cal. of Irish State Papers*; *Orrery State Papers*, 2 vols., 1743; J. Prendergast's *Ireland* (1660-90), 1887; and R. B. O'Brien's *Hist. Studies* (1649-1775), 1903. For the exile period, see *Memoirs of the Duchess Sophia*, Leipsic, 1889; *Mémoires of Mademoiselle de Montpensier* and of *Madame de Moteville*, various edns.; *Mémoires of Cardinal de Retz*, 1774; Monk's *Collection of Letters* (1659-60), 1714; *Boscobel Tracts*, 1837, reprinted in A. Fea's *After Worcester*, 1904; and Sir P. Warwick's *Memoirs* (1625-69), 1701. See also S. E. Hopkins's *Charles II. in the Channel Isles*, 2 vols., 1854; C. J. Lyon's *Personal Hist. of Charles II.* (1650-1), 1851; Davis's *Hist.*, 1660; Egglefield's *Monarchy Renewed*, 1661, new edn., 1882; Lloyd's *True Portrait*, 1660; and Eva Scott's *King in Exile* (1646-54), 1905, and *Travels* (1654-60), 1907. General contemporary authorities include, Earl of Ailesbury's *Memoirs*, 2 vols., 1890 [specially valuable on account of his close relations with the king]. *Works of Halifax* and of John, Duke of Buckingham, 2 vols., 1753; Burnet's *Own Time*, many edns. [hostile, but containing interesting details]; Evelyn's *Diary* (1620-1706), best edn. that by Austin Dobson, 3 vols., 1906; Pepys' *Diary*, best edn. that by Wheatley, 1893-99 [invaluable for the Social Life of London and the Court]; Count Grammont's *Mémoires* by A. Hamilton; Baronne de Aulnoy's *Memoirs of the Court of England in 1675*, 1913; N. Luttrell's *Brief Relation* (1678-1714), 6 vols., 1857; and Sir J. Reresby's *Memoirs* (1634-89), ed. Cartwright, 1875. Modern historical works, in addition to some previously mentioned, include O. Airy's *The English Restoration and Louis XIV.* (1648-79), 1888; *Cambridge Mod. Hist.*, vol. v. (age of Louis XIV.); Hales's *Fall of the Stuarts* (1678-1697), 1876; C. B. R. Kent's *Hist. of the Tories* (1660-1702), 1908; O. Klopp's *Fall des Hauses Stuart* (1678-1714), 1875-88; Macaulay's *Hist. of England* (the brilliant but misleading introductory summary); *Pol. Hist. of England*, ed. Hunt and Lane-Poole, vol. viii. (1660-1702), by Prof. Lodge. See also Biscoe's *Earls of Middleton*, 1876; W. D. Christie's *Life of Shaftesbury*, 2 vols., 1871; P. Cunningham's *Nell Gwynne*, various edns.; Dryden's *Works*; Forneron's *Louise de Kérouaille*, 1886, trans. 1888; J. J. Jusserand, *A French Ambassador [Cominges] at the Court of*

Charles II.; W. A. Taylor's *England under Charles II.*, 1892; T. Longueville's *Rochester, and other Literary Rakes*, 1902; Masson's *Life of Milton*; H. Wheatley's *Pepys and the World he lived in*, 1880; I. Pollock's *The Popish Plot*, 1903; and R. Crauford's *Last Days of Charles II.*, 1909. Modern lives include those by W. Harris, 2 vols., 1766; J. F. Molloy, 2 vols., 1885; and especially Sir A. W. Ward in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, 1887, and O. Airy (Goupil Ser.), 1901, cheap edn., 1904.

For James II., many of the works mentioned under Charles are available. Among the MSS. referred to in the reports of the Hist. MSS., the Dartmouth (*XI. Rep.*, App., pt. v., 1887) and the Stuart papers at Windsor are of special importance, as is also the *Cal. of Irish State Papers*. A very large and invaluable collection of letters and documents is included in the Marquise Campana de Cavelli's voluminous *Les Derniers Stuarts à St Germain-en-laye*, 2 vols., 1871. Many of the letters of Barillon (French Ambassador in London) have also been published in Dalrymple's *Memoirs* and C. J. Foxe's *James II.*, 1808; see further, *Négotiations du Comte d'Avaux en Hollande* (1679-88), 6 vols., 1752-3; *D'Avaux Négotiations en Irlande* (1688-90) [privately printed for the Foreign Office, 1830]; *Carstare State Papers* (1689-1711), 1711; *Clarendon Correspondence* (1676-90), 2 vols., 1828; *Duckett Papers*, 4 vols., 1898; *Leven and Melville Papers* (1689-91), Ban. Club, 1843; *Lettres et Mémoires de Marie Reigne d'Angleterre*, ed. Countess Bentinck, 1880; and *Memoirs and Letters of Mary, Queen of England*, ed. Doebner, 1886. An important if prejudiced contemporary authority is Clarke's *Life of James II.*, 2 vols., 1816; prepared at the instance of James Francis Edward from original memoirs and other authentic sources. Others are Balcarres's *Memoirs* (1688-90), Ban. Club, 1841; various papers and tracts in the *Harleian Misc. Collection of State Tracts* (1688-1702), 3 vols., 1705-7; *Life of Lord Guildford* in R. North's *Lives of the Norths*, 3 vols., 1826; and the *Corresp. of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough*, 3 vols., 4th ed., 1724; *Life of James II.*, 3rd ed., 1705; Eachard's *Hist.*, 1778, and *Secret Hist. of Europe*, 3 vols., 4th ed., 1724. For the period of exile see Biscoe's *Earls of Middleton*, 1876; G. Du Bosq. de Beaumont's *Cour des Stuarts à St Germain-en-laye* (1689-1718), 1912; Capafigue's *James II. à St Germain*, 2 vols., 1833; *Mémoires du Duc de Berwick*, 1771; Dangeau's *Journal* (1684-

1720), 1854-60; E. and M. S. Grew's *English Court in Exile*, 1911; *Mémoires de Madame de la Fayette*, ed. Assé, 1890; *Letters of Eliz. Char., Duchess of Orleans*, 1869; *Mémoires de St Simon*, 20 vols., 1873-7; and the Marchesa Vittelleschi's *Court in Exile*, 2 vols., 1900. The most detailed, if also the most biassed, account of the reign of James II. is that of Lord Macaulay. Other modern works, besides those previously alluded to, are J. H. Jesse's *Jacob. Memoirs* (1688-1760), 3 vols., 1843; C. J. Foxe's *Hist.*, 1808; G. Rose's *Observations on the Work of Foxe*, 1809; S. Heywood's *Vind. of Foxe*, 1811; A. Fea's *King Monmouth*, 1902, and *James II. and his Wives*, 1908; C. T. Wilson's *James II. and the Duke of Berwick*, 1876; T. Longueville's *Adventures of James II.*, 1904; and M. Haile's *Mary of Modena*, 1908. See also the *James II.* by Sir A. W. Ward in *Dict. of National Biog.*, 1892.

Many of the letters of James Francis Edward are included in the Stuart Papers at Windsor, now in course of publication. Various letters are bound up with Lockhart's *Memoirs*, 2 vols., 1807; Macpherson's *Original Papers*, 1775; *Stuart Papers* (1717-25), Madan's *Stuart Papers* (1689-1715), 1889; Brown's *Hist. of the Highlands*, 4 vols., 1834-6, and Thornton's *Stuart Dynasty*, 1889. Various letters, including correspondence with Cardinal Gualterio, are in the British Museum. See also letters of Thomas Innes in the Edin. University Library, the correspondence of Horace Mann and other Tuscan papers in the Record Office, the *Cal. State Papers*, reigns of George I. and II., and the Reports of the Hist. MSS. Comm. Contemporary memoirs, not previously alluded to, include *Intrigues of the Chevalier de St George*, 1714; *Sec. Hist. of the Chevalier de St George*, 1714; *Letter of Mr Lesley to a Member of Parliament*, 1714; the Duke of Lorraine's *Letter to Her Majesty, &c.*, 1714; *Secret Memoirs of Bar-le-duc*, 1716; *Hist. of the Jacobite Club*, 1712; *Memoirs of the Chevalier de St George*, 1712; J. Allardyce's *Hist. Papers* (1689-1750), New Spalding Club, 2 vols., 1895-6; Bishop Atterbury's *Corresp. in Works*, vol. i., 1896; Bolingbroke's *Letter to Wyndham*, and other references in *Works*, 1773, and later edns.; *Works of Gray*, ed. Gosse, vol. ii.; N. Hooke's *Corresp.* (1703-7), Rox. Club, 2 vols., 1870-1, and *Sec. Hist.* (1707-9), 1760; J. Ker's *Memoirs*, 1726; Keysler's *Travels through Germany*, 1756; J. Macky's *Memoirs*, 1733; Earl of Mar's *Legacies*, 1727-8, in *Scot. Hist. Misc.*, 1896;

Marchmont Papers, 2 vols., 1831; *Letters of Ormonde relating to Alberoni's Project of 1719*, Scot. Hist. Soc., 1895, and *Letters of the Duke of Perth*, Camden Soc., 1845. See further *A full authentic Narr. of the Invasion*, 1715; *True Account of the Proceedings at Perth, by a Rebel*, 1716; Paton's *Hist. of the Rebellion*, 1717; *Revolution d'Écosse et d'Irlande* (1707-9), 1728; *Allan Cameron's Narr.*, ed. Terry, in *Scot. Hist. Review*, vol. v. (Jan. 1908); *Rebellion Papers*, 1715 and 1745, in *Scot. Hist. Misc.*, 1893; and *News Letters of 1715-16*, ed. A. E. Steuart, 1910. Modern works include R. Chambers's *Hist. of the Rebellion*, 1829, and later edns.; Charles de Brosse's *L'Italie il y a cent Ans*, 1836; A. T. Thomson's *Memoirs of the Jacobites of 1715 and 1745*, 3 vols., 1845-6; J. H. Jesse's *Memoirs of the Pretender* (1688-1746), 2 vols., 1845; J. Denniston's *Memoirs of Sir Robert Strange and of Andrew Lumisden*, 2 vols., 1853; Lacroix de Marles' *Histoire du Chevalier de Sainte-Georges et du Prince Charles Edouard*, 1860; J. K. Oliphant's *Jacobite Lairds of Gask* (1142-1847), 1870; J. Doran's *Mann and Manners at the Court of Florence*, 1875, and *London in Jacobite Times*, 1877; Estcourt and Payne's *English Catholic Nonjurors of 1715*, 1885; Dallari's *Il Matrimonio di Giacomo Stuart, Duca di York, con Maria d'Este*, 2 vols., 1896; C. S. Terry's *The Chevalier de St George, &c.* (1701-1720), 1901; J. Colin's *Louis XV. et les Jacobites* (1734-44), 1901; M. Haile's *James Francis Edward*, 1907; Lang and Shield's *The King Over the Water*, 1907; and L. Melville's *Duke of Wharton*, 1913.

For Charles Edward and Henry, Cardinal York, most of the works relating to their father are of more or less importance. See also for Charles Edward various Reports of the Hist. MSS. Com.; *Albemarle Papers* (1746-8), 2 vols., 1902; *Atholl Corresp.*, Abbotsford Club, 1840; *Cochrane Corresp.*, Maitl. Club, 1836; *Trial of General Cope*, 1749; Lord Elcho's *Short Account* (1744-6), ed. Charteris, 1907; Bishop Forbes's *Lyon in Mourning*, Scot. Hist. Soc., 3 vols., 1895-6; A. Henderson's *Hist. of the Rebellion* (1745-6), 1748; J. Home's *Hist. of the Rebellion*, 1802, and in *Works*, 1822, vol. v.; Chevalier Johnstone's *Memoirs*, complete edn., 1870; various *Memoirs and Lives* of Lord Lovat, his *Trial*, 1747, and *Corresp.* (1740-5) in the Laing Coll. in the University of Edinburgh; *The Highlanders at Macclesfield in 1745*, with notes by W. G. Blaikie in vol. vi. of the *Scot. Hist. Review* (April 1909); D. Macallister's *Letters*, 2 vols.,

1767; J. Drummond Macgregor's *Letters in Blackwood's Magazine* for December 1819; Lord George Murray's *Marches of the Highland Army* and other Papers, in R. Chambers's *Jacobite Memoirs*, 1834; J. Murray of Broughton's *Memorials* (1740-7), Scot. Hist. Soc., 1898; Neal MacEachain's *Narrative in New Monthly Magazine*, Nov. 1840; J. Maxwell's *Narr. of the Exped. to Scotl.* (1745-6), 1841; J. Ray's *Complete Hist. of the Rebellion*, 1754; *Relics of the Rebellion*, 1745-6, in *Misc. of the Spottiswoode Soc.*, 1845; various papers in the *Spalding Club Misc.*, vol. i., 1841; the Earl of Rosebery's *List of Persons concerned in the Rebellion*, Scot. Hist. Soc., 1890; and *Whitefoord Papers*, 1898. Modern works include W. G. Blaikie's admirable *Itinerary*, with append. of papers and a map of Prince Charlie's marches and wanderings, Scot. Hist. Soc., 1897; Burt's *Letters from the Highlands*, 1818; the Earl of Stanhope's *The '45*, 1852; *Recollections of Marshal Macdonald*, 1892; C. S. Terry's *Rising of the '45*, 1900; and A. B. Tulloch's *The '45*, 1908. Various information will be found in Sir William Fraser's *Earls of Cromarty*, 2 vols., 1876, and his *Chiefs of Grant*, 3 vols., 1883, and in Mackenzie's *History of the Macdonalds*, 1882. See also R. Cadell's *Sir J. Cope and the Rebellion of '45*, 1898; A. Lang's *Pickle the Spy*, 1897, and *Companions of Pickle*, 1898; E. M. Barron's *Prince Charlie's Pilot*, 1913; A. Macgregor's *Life of Flora Macdonald*, 1882; W. Jolly's *Flora Macdonald in Hist.*, 1886; D. M. Rose's *Prince Charles's French Friends*, 1896; Louis Duc de La Trémoille's *A Royalist Family and Prince Charles Edward*, 1910; Von Reumont's *Die Gräfin von Albany*; Vernon Lee's charming *Countess of Albany*, 1884; and the Marchesa Vittelleschi's *Court in Exile*, 2 vols., 1900. Later information has partly discounted the *Life of Charles Edward*, by W. Ewald, 1886. Later lives are those of A. Lang (Goupil Ser.), 1900, C. S. Terry, 1900, W. Drummond Norrie, 4 vols., 1907, W. Power, 1912, and J. C. Hadden, 1913.

For Henry Benedict see, in addition, *Coll. of Miscell. Papers*, bound in one vol. in the British Museum; *Orazione per la Morte*, Rome, 1807; *Letters from the Cardinal Borgia and the Cardinal York*, 1779-1800; Horace Walpole's *Letters*; Wraxall's *Hist. Memoirs*, 1904; H. M. Vaughan's *The Last of the Royal Stuarts*, 1906; and A. Shield's *Henry Stuart, Cardinal of York*, 1908.

INDEX.

- ABBOT, EDWIN, Archbishop of Canterbury, 240
 Aberdeen, Assembly at, 211, 248
 Ailesbury, Robert Bruce, 1st Earl of, quoted, 224, 366; with James II. at Faversham, 442; quoted, 443; mentioned, 445
 Ainslie's Tavern, 147
 Aix-la-Chapelle, Treaty of, 352, 527
 Alan, dapifer of Dol, 4
 Alan the Steward, 5
 Albany, Alexander, 3rd Duke of, son of James II., imprisoned but escapes, 58; goes to France, 58; invades Scotland, 60; comes to terms with James III., 62; returns to England, 63; death, 63
 Albany, John, 4th Duke of, chosen regent, 94; arrives in Scotland, 95; in arms at Stirling, 96; outstays his leave, 98; obtains divorce for the Queen-Dowager, 99
 Albany, Louise Maximilienne de Stolberg, Countess of, married to Charles Edward, 531; escapes from him, 532; patronised by the Cardinal York, 532, 542; attaches herself to Alfieri, 532, and after his death to Fabre, 533; death, 533; letter of the Cardinal York to, 541
 Albany, Murdoch, Earl of Fife, and 2nd Duke of, obtains his liberty from the Tower, 29; at the enthronement of James I., 31; executed, 35
 Albany, Robert, Earl of Fife and 1st Duke of, Guardian of Scotland, 23; imprisons the Duke of Rothesay, 25. See also Fife, Earl of
 Alexander, second High Steward, 6
 Alfieri, Vittorio, and the Countess of Albany, 532; death, 533
 Allan, Lieutenant Thomas, 534
 Amiens, James, Duke of York at, 385
 Andrew the painter, 18
 Angus of the Isles, 75
 Angus, Archibald, 5th Earl of ("Bell-the-Cat"), 56; makes a raid on the Borders, 59; enters into an agreement with Douglas, 61; in arms against James III., 66; in alliance with Henry VII., 73; made Lord High Chancellor, 74
 Angus, Archibald, 6th Earl of, 94; marries the queen-dowager, 95; rupture with her, 97; sent to France, escapes and comes to England, 97; returns to Scotland, and in the council of regency, 98; divorced from the queen-dowager, 99; assumes charge of the king, 99; escape of the king from, 100; in exile, 101;
 Angus, George, 4th Earl of, 51
 Angus, William, 10th Earl of, signs the "Spanish Blanks," 175
 Annabella, Princess, daughter of James I., 44
 Anne of Brittany and James IV., 85
 Anne of Denmark married to James VI., 172; rumoured partiality for the "Bonny Earl of Moray," 174; rebuked by the Kirk, 176; professes Catholicism, 179; James denies her conversion, 185; her Court masques, 220
 Anne, Princess, afterwards Queen, married to Prince George of Denmark, 401; at Bath at the time of her brother's birth, 426, doubts his legitimacy, 427; joins the rebels in the Midlands, 438; quarrels with her sister, 452; death of her only son, 462; accession, 462; gives her

- consent to the Treaty of Union, 463; relations with her brother, 466; death, 469
- Antwerp, truce of, 201
- Arabella, the Lady, 179
- Ardnamurchan, MacIain of, 75
- Argyll, Archibald, 5th Earl of, ally of Moray against Darnley, 134; a fugitive, 136
- Argyll, Archibald, 8th Earl and Marquis of, a Covenanting leader, 257; relations with Charles II., 305, 309, 313; sway at an end, 316; execution, 335
- Argyll, Archibald, 9th Earl of, condemned and flees to Holland, 400; futile expedition, 411
- Argyll, Colin, 1st Earl of, 66, 75
- Argyll, John, Duke of, reinforced, 475; advances against the rebels, 476; resists Jacobite intrigues, 482
- Arisaig, Charles Edward at, 496
- Arkaig, Loch, 521
- Arlington, Countess of, 340
- Arlington, Henry Bennet, Earl of, one of the Cabal, 351; signs secret Treaty of Dover, 362
- Armada, the, 171
- Arran, James, 2nd Lord Hamilton and 1st Earl of, marries the Princess Margaret Stewart, 57; in command of the fleet, 85; one of the council, 94; next heir to the crown, 97; in association with the queen-dowager, 98; supports Angus, 99
- Arran, James, 2nd Earl of, and Duke of Châtellherault, 113; in opposition to Mary, 134; an exile in France, 136
- Arran, James Stewart, Earl of, favourite of James VI., 165; overthrow and escape, 168
- Arras, relief of, 383
- Arundel, Lord of Wardour, 353
- Ashburnham, John, accompanies Charles I. to the Isle of Wight, 280
- Assassination Plot, the, 454
- Assynt, capture of Montrose in, 310
- Atholl, David, 13th Earl of, comes to terms with Edward III., 10
- Atholl, William Murray, attainted Duke of, accompanies Charles Edward to Scotland, 495; in the affair of Glen-shiel, 500; unfurls the standard at Glenfinnan, 501
- Atholl, William Stewart, Earl of, conspires against James I., 42; executed, 43
- Atterbury, Francis, Bishop of Rochester, 477; new plot of, 482
- Auchinleck Chronicle*, quoted, 49
- Avignon, James Francis Edward at, 478; leaves it for Italy, 479; visit to it, 485; Charles Edward at, 526; again arrives at, 527; Henry Benedict at, 536
- Ayala, Spanish ambassador, quoted, 71, 72, 76, 79
- Babington Conspiracy, the, 155, 170
- Bacon, Francis, Lord, quoted, 182, 200; speeches on the Union, 203, suggestion to the king, 204; political views, 205; made attorney-general, 205; quoted, 226
- Baillie, Charles, 154
- Balcarres, Colin Lindsay, Earl of, interview with James II. and VII., 444
- Balfour, Sir James, his *Annals*, quoted, 310
- Balhaldy, Macgregor of, 491, 492
- Balliol, Edward, crowned at Scone, 8; action against, 9; overruns southwestern Scotland, 10; delivers up the Scottish crown to Edward III., 11; death, 14
- Balloch, Donald, 40, 54
- Bampfild, Colonel Joseph, effects the escape of the Duke of York, 379; retires to England, 380
- Bancroft, Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, 240
- Bannockburn, battle of, 7
- Banquo, 3
- Barclay, Sir George, his assassination plot, 454
- Barebones, Praise-God, 326
- Barillon, French ambassador, statements of James II. and VII. to, 406; quoted, 414, 444
- Barking Creeke, 350
- Bar-le-duc, James Francis Edward at, 467; debarred from, 478
- Barton, Sir Andrew, 81; death of, 82
- Barton, Robert, 78, 84
- Basilicon Doron*, the, 177
- Bavaria, royal line of, 547
- Baxter, Richard, quoted, 265
- Beaton, Archibald, Archbishop of Glasgow, 94; made chancellor, 95; mean plot of Wolsey against, 97; placed in ward but again set at liberty, 98; entertains Angus, 100
- Beaton, David, Archbishop of St Andrews, 105; ambassador to

- France, 108; cardinal-archbishop, influence over James V., 109
- Beauchamp, Lord, 313
- Beaufort, Cardinal, in Scotland, 41
- Beaufort, Jane, married to James I., 31; heroine of *The Kingis Quair*, 31; removes James II. to Stirling, 45; married to Sir James Stewart, and warded by Livingstone, 45; death and burial, 46
- Beaumont, John, 220
- Bedloe, William, 361; accuses the queen, 363
- Bellarmino, Cardinal, his controversy with James VI. and I., 197
- Bellasis, Lady, and the Duke of York, 391
- Bellings, Richard, 353
- Benalder, Cluny's cave in, 525
- Benedict XIII., Pope, 484, 485
- Benson, Admiral, 517
- Bentivoglio, Cardinal, quoted, 192
- Berkeley, Sir Charles, 387
- Berkeley, Sir John, accompanies Charles I. to the Isle of Wight, 280; in charge of the Duke of York, 380; accompanies him to the French army, 383; created Baron Berkeley, 384
- Berkshire, Thomas Howard, Earl of, governor of Charles II., 299
- Berwick, James Fitzjames, Duke of, son of James II. and VII., accompanies his father in flight to France, 445; in England, 454; mentioned, 460; declines to go to Scotland, 472
- Berwick-on-Tweed, 54; besieged, 60; obtained by Edward IV., 61; mentioned, 77; treaty of, 100; pacification of, 248
- Bishops, the seven, petition, trial, and acquittal of, 423
- Bisset, Baldred, quoted, 1
- Black, David, ordered north the Tay, 176
- Blois, treaty at, 154
- Bloody Bay, battle of, 75
- Boece, Hector, 86
- Bombay, 337
- Booth, Charles, quoted, 465
- Booth, Sir George, defeat of, 325, 385
- Borgia, Cardinal, 545
- Borough Muir, Edinburgh, muster at, 86
- Borradaile, Charles Edward at, 497; sets out for, 521; embarks at, 525
- Borthwick, Lord, 96
- Boswell, James, quoted, 18
- Bothwell, Adam Hepburn, 2nd Earl, killed at Flodden, 89
- Bothwell, Francis Stewart, 5th Earl, reputed wizard, 173; holds James VI. in terror, 174; excommunicated and flees the country, 175
- Bothwell, James Hepburn, 4th Earl, let slip by Mary, 135; supports her on her flight to Dunbar, 141; her passion for him, 143; married to Lady Jean Gordon, 144; undertakes to get rid of Darnley, 145; cleared by an assize, 147; elopes with Mary, 147; married to her, 148; flight from Carberry, 149
- Bothwell, Patrick Hepburn, 1st Earl, 74
- Boulogne, Duke of York at, 385
- Bourbon, Antoinette de, 116
- Bowes, Sir Robert, captured, 109
- Boyd, Robert, 1st Lord, appointed governor of James III., 55; fall and flight, 56
- Boyd, Robert, 4th Lord, in arms against Mary, 134
- Boyd, Sir Alexander, in charge of James III., 55; executed, 57
- Boyd, Thomas, illegally created Earl of Arran, marries the king's sister, 56; escapes to Denmark, 56; divorced from her, 57
- Boyle, Richard, death of, 392
- Boyne, the battle of the, 451
- Bradshaw, John, regicide, body exposed at Tyburn, 330
- Breda, Treaty of, 349
- Brest, James II. and VII., sails from, 449; lands at, 451; Irish troops at, 452
- Bristol, stormed, 267; surrendered by Rupert, 272
- Bristol, George Digby, 2nd Earl of, 320
- Bristol, John Digby, 1st Earl, ambassador to Spain, 215
- Brown, Mr J. T. T., quoted, 32
- Bruce, Marjory, married to the Steward, 7
- Bruce, Robert the [Robert I. of Scotland], 7; death, 8
- Buchanan, George, on the Dalriadic dynasty, 2; quoted, 68, 69, 101; satire against the Franciscans, 105; tutor of James VI., 160
- Buckingham, George Villiers, 1st Duke of, relations with James VI. and I. and Prince Charles, 207; with

- Charles at Madrid, 215; predominance, 216; promotes the French marriage, 216; impeaches Middlesex, 226; inglorious expeditions, 231; assassinated, 232
- Buckingham, George Villiers, 2nd Duke of, and Charles II., 301; mentioned, 315; quoted, 346, 347; one of the Cabal, 351; opposes the Non-resistance Bill, 356; his *mot*, 391
- Bull, Stephen, his ships captured, 73
- Burford, Charles II. in the inn yard of, 317
- Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, quoted, 301, 335, 346, 349, 357, 364, 386, 388, 390, 391, 401, 406, 408, 409, 413
- Burns, Robert, on the Covenanters, 245
- Bye Plot, the, 184
- Byng, Admiral, prevents French landing at Edinburgh, 465
- Cabal, the, 351; dissolution of, 355
- Cadiz, expedition to, 231
- Calais, relief of, 384
- Calderwood, David, quoted, 168
- Cambuskenneth Abbey, 69, 72
- Cameron, Dr Archibald, 497
- Cameron, Donald of Lochiel, joins Charles Edward, 497; his men seize Edinburgh, 505; at Gladsmuir, 508
- Caprara, Maria Vittoria di, 480
- Caracenas, Marquis de, 385
- Carberry Hill, 149, 507
- Carey, Lady, governess of Charles I., 222
- Carey, Sir Robert, brings news to James VI. of his recognition by the Council, 181; quoted, 222
- Carisbrook Castle, Charles I. in, 280
- Carlisle Castle surrenders, 514; garrison left in, 517
- Carlos, Don, proposed marriage to Mary Queen of Scots, 117, 125, 126, 127, 129
- Carlyle, "Jupiter," quoted, 510
- Carlyle, Thomas, quoted, 206, 212, 251, 285, 288
- Carr, Robert, created Viscount Rochester, and later Earl of Somerset, his abilities and disposition, 206; supersession, 207; referred to, 210
- Carrick, John, Earl of, 13, 16
- Casket Letters, the, 146, 151
- Castlemaine, the Countess of. See Cleveland.
- Castlemaine, Roger Palmer, Earl of, ambassador to the Pope, 420
- Catechism, the Larger and Shorter, 268
- Catherine de Medicis, quoted, 114; relations with Mary Stewart, 117
- Catherine of Braganza married to Charles II., 337; relations with, 338; denounced by Oates and Bedloe, but defended by Charles, 363
- Cecil, Robert. See Salisbury.
- Chaillot, Convent of, heart of James II. deposited in, 456; coffin of Mary of Modena deposited in, 457
- Chalmers, George, quoted, 4
- Charles I., 186, 191; sets out to Madrid, 215; agrees to a marriage by proxy to the Infanta of Spain, but resolves that it should not take place, 216; negotiations for marriage to Henrietta Maria, 216; birth, baptism, &c., 222; characteristics, 223; contrasted with Charles II., 224; bad start, 226; favours the impeachment of Middlesex, 226; accession and marriage, 227; evil results of marriage, 228; on bad terms with the queen, 229; reconciliation, 230; difficulties with the Commons, 231; assents to the Petition of Right, 232; declaration on the Montague case, 233; quarrel with the Commons, 234; position compared with that of Cromwell, 235; break with the Commons, 237; dispenses with the Parliament, 237; ship-money tax, 238; ecclesiastical policy, 238; Scottish policy, 240; coronation in Scotland, 240; imposition of a liturgy, 243; flatters the Covenanters, 247; comes to terms with them, 248; dilemma, 249; resorts to Strafford for counsel, 250; vain attempts to raise money, 250; agrees to summon a Parliament, 252; agrees to provide money for the hostile Scottish army, 252; assents to Strafford's execution, 253; fatal concessions, 254; goes to Scotland, 256; intrigues there, 257; returns, and is feasted in the Guildhall, 259; replies to the Grand Remonstrance, 260; impeaches the five members, 261; pardons them, 262; sets out for Yorkshire, 262; refuses to grant the militia, 263; sets up his stand-

ard at Nottingham, 265; wins the battle of Edgehill, and returns to Oxford, where he has fruitless negotiations with the Parliament, 266; campaign in the south, 269; action against Essex and Waller, 270; fruitless negotiations with the Parliament, 271; storms Leicester, but is defeated at Naseby, 272; captures Huntingdon, 272; takes refuge in Oxford, 273; various schemes, 274; surrenders himself to the Scots, 275; brought to Holmsby House, 276; negotiations with the Parliament and the army, 277 *sq.*; at Hampton Court, 279; escapes to the Isle of Wight, 279; concludes agreement with Scottish commissioners, 281; removed to Hurst Castle, 283; arrives at Windsor, 284; trial, 285; condemnation, 286; execution, 287; last speech, 287; characteristics, 289; influence on the future, 292; burial, 293; literary and artistic tastes, 294; children, 295; decides as to the baptism of Charles II., 297

Charles II., 191; contrasted with his father, 224; accompanies his father to the north, 263; birth of, 296; appearance, 297; governors and tutors, 297; takes his seat in the House of Lords, 298; at Edgehill, 299; in the Royalist Parliament at Oxford, 299; accompanies the army to the west, 299; goes to Jersey and thence to France, 300; courts Mademoiselle de Montpensier, 301; in Paris, 301; with the revolted fleet, 302; returns to the Hague, 303; relations with Lucy Walter, 303; receives news of his father's execution, 304; proclaimed king at Edinburgh, 304; relations with the Scottish commissioners and Montrose, 305; at St Germain's, marriage proposals with Mademoiselle de Montpensier, 305; relations with his mother, 306; second visit to Jersey, 307; directs Montrose to proceed to Scotland, 307; agrees with the Covenanters, 308; final attitude to Montrose, 310; embarks for Scotland, 311; caught in a trap, 311; overborne by the Covenanters, 312; secluded in Dunfermline, 313; has to sign a declaration, 313; his own

convictions, 313; the "Start," 315; coronation, 316; defeated at Worcester and takes refuge in the west of England, 317; lands in France, 318; renews proposals to Mademoiselle de Montpensier, 319; flirtation with the Duchess de Chatillon, 319; pursuit of pleasure, 320; at Spa and Cologne, 321; signs treaty with Spain, 322; at the assault on Mardike, 323; position after the death of Cromwell, 324-6; proclaimed king in London, 327; journey thither, and reception, 328; characteristics as Restoration King, 329; position in Ireland, 331; in Scotland, 332; ecclesiastical attitude and policy, 335-6; marriage, 337; relations with Louis XIV., 337; with the Countess of Cleveland, 338; other mistresses, 340-1; character of his court, 341; amusements, 342; artistic proclivities, 345; scientific bent, 346; social characteristics, 346; misuse of his gifts, 347; pecuniary relations with Louis XIV., 348; attitude to the Dutch War, 349; concludes the Triple Alliance, 352; Catholic purposes, 352; secret Treaty of Dover, 353; expedients to raise money, 354; agrees to the Test Act, 354; entrusts Lord Danby with management of his affairs, 356; relations with Louis XIV., 357; arranges marriage of the Prince of Orange to Mary daughter of the Duke of York, 358; last stage of his sovereignty, 359; attitude to Titus Oates, 360; protects Danby, 362; declines to divorce the queen, 363; marriage to Lucy Walter denied, 364, 398; attitude to the Exclusion Bill, &c., 365 *sq.*; appoints Parliament to meet at Oxford, 368; dissolves it, 369; pecuniary arrangement with Louis XIV., 370; plot against him at the Rye House, 371; later years, 372; death, 373; Catholic beliefs, 373; character of his reign, 374; burial, 376; sends Duke of York to Holland and then to Scotland, 398-9; papers in proof of his Catholicism published by James II., 415

Charles Edward (in Jacobite opinion, Charles III.), birth of, 482, 489; nurses and tutors, 483, 489; Scottish

- adventure, 486; on bad terms with his father, 487; characteristics, 489; at Gaeta, 490; Italian tour, 491; sets out for France, 492; plans new expedition, 493; reasons for doing so, 494; sets sail, 495; reception in the Hebrides, 496; arrives at Borradaile and summons the chiefs, 497; sets up his standard, 498; marches to Perth, 499; dislike of Lord George Murray, 502; marches from Perth, 503; enters Holyrood, 505; sets out against Cope, 506; wins Gladsmuir, 508; its disappointing results, 509; marches into England, bent on going to London, but followers refuse to go beyond Derby, 516; resolves never again to consult the army council, 516; on march north leaves garrison in Carlisle, 517; sets siege to Stirling Castle, 517; after battle of Falkirk consents, under protest, to retire to Inverness, 518; at Inverness, 519; defeated at Culloden, 520; passes into Stratharick, 521; and thence into the Hebrides, 522; wanderings, dangers, and hardships, 522-5; escapes to France, 525; in Paris, 525-6; goes secretly to Spain, 526; insults the officials of Louis XVI., and sent a prisoner to Vincennes, 527; undertakes to leave France, 527; resumes wanderings, 528; in London, 528; joins the Anglican communion, 528; deterioration, 529; relations with Miss Walkinshaw, 529; returns to Rome after the death of his father, 531; marriage, 531; separation, 532, 540; recalls his daughter, 532, 542; last days, death, and burial, 533, 543; posthumous repute, 534
- Charles VIII. of France, 77
- Charles IX. of France, 117; death of, 154
- Charles XII. of Sweden, death of, 480
- Charles Emanuel IV. of Sardinia, 547
- Châtelard, 114
- Chatillon, Duchess de, 319
- Cheriton, battle of, 269
- Chesterfield, Lady, and James II., 389
- Christis Kirk*, 33
- Churchill, Arabella, and the Duke of York, 390, 396; her children, 460.
- Clanranalds, the, 497
- Clarendon, Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of, quoted, 215, 226, 238, 239, 241, 244, 249, 259, 287, 289, 291, 298, 299, 300, 303; in sympathy with Montrose, 305; on begging mission to Madrid, 305; quoted 306, 309, 312, 318, 320, 321, 322, 324, 325, 326, 327; made Lord Chancellor, 330; assists Charles II. in his Lady Castlemaine difficulty, 338; quoted, 347; fall of, 350; quoted, 382; distress at his daughter's situation, 387; regrets her Catholicism, 390
- Clarendon, Henry Hyde, 2nd Earl of, made Lord Privy Seal, 407; Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 419; superseded, 420
- Clarke, James S., his *Life of James II.* quoted, 353, 376, 406, 407
- Classes, Act of, 305, 316
- "Cleanse the Causeway," 97
- Clement XII., Pope, 486
- Clement XIV., Pope, 532
- Clementina, Princess Sobieski, arrangement for her marriage to James Francis Edward frustrated by her arrest, 480; her escape, 481; married by proxy, 482; quarrels with her husband and retires to a nunnery, 483; returns, 485; death, 486
- Cleveland, Louisa Palmer, Countess of Castlemaine and Duchess of, 338, 377
- Clifford, Thomas, 1st Lord, one of the Cabal, 351; signs secret Treaty of Dover, 353
- Clifton, sally at, 516
- Cloche, James de la, 376
- Clova, Charles II. at, 315
- Cochrane, Robert, favourite of James III., hanged at Lauder, 61
- Cockenzie, 507
- Coke, Roger, quoted, 217
- Coleman, Edward, accused by Oates, 360
- Colepeper, John, 1st Lord, 302
- College of Justice, the, 103
- Cologne, Charles II. at, 321
- "Coltbridge, canter of," 504
- Confession of Faith, the, 268
- Congleton, 515
- Contract, the Great, 204
- Conventicle Act, the first, 337
- Cooper, Ashley. See Shaftesbury
- Cope, Sir John, advances into the Highlands, 499; retreats to Inverness, 500; at Dunbar, 505; his line of battle, 507; defeat, 508; retreats to Berwick, 509

- Copredy Bridge, battle of, 270
 Corporation Act, the, 335
 Corridale, Glen, Charles Edward in, 524
 Corryarrick, Pass of, 500
 Cottington, the Earl of, on begging mission to Madrid, 308
 Covenant, the king's, 246
 Covenant, the National, 245, 247; compulsory subscription of, 248
 Covenant, the Solemn League and, attempt to impose it on Great Britain and Ireland, 268; repudiated by the Cromwellians, 279; broken by the English Presbyterians, 281; burned by the hangman in Edinburgh, 333
 Covenanters, the, ambitions, 246; their "Free Assembly," 247; on Dunse Law, 248; cross the Tweed and advance to the Tees, 251; obtain maintenance for their army, 252; demands agreed to and return home, 253; seek to extend Presbyterianism over Great Britain and Ireland, 268; army marches into England, 269; at Marston Moor, 269; entrap Charles I., 275; leave for Scotland, 276; persecution of, 334, 399, 417
 Coventry, Sir William, secretary of the Navy, 391
 Craig, John, chaplain of James I., his sermon, 174
 Craigmillar Castle, 58
 Crawar, Paul, executed, 38
 Crawford, Alexander Lindsay, 4th Earl of, ravages the diocese of St Andrews, 47; conspires with Douglas against James II., 48; routed at Brechin, 49; attainted, 50; death, 50
 Crewe, Nathaniel, Bishop of Oxford, 396
 Crichton, Sir William, governor of Edinburgh Castle, 45; reconciled to Livingstone and made chancellor, 45; kidnaps James II., 46; conspires with Livingstone to murder the young Earl of Douglas, 46; compact with Bishop Kennedy, 47
 Crofts, Lord, 320
 Cromwell, Oliver, his ecclesiastical dilemma, 235; out-Charleses Charles, 236; contemplates possibility of emigration, 259; drilling his Ironsides, 268; victory at Winceby, 269; at Marston Moor, 269; in favour with the sectaries, 270; accuses Manchester of backwardness, 270; retains his own command, 271; at Naseby, 272; violates his Covenanting oath, 277; obtains toleration for the sectaries, 279; defeats the Scots at Preston, 282; his mystical convictions, 282; story about him, 284; quoted, 285; connection with the execution of Charles I., 288; relation to public opinion, 289; career created by Charles I., 291; his failure, 292; victories in Ireland, 307; victory at Dunbar, 314; offers reward for capture of Charles II., 322; in alliance with France, 322, 381; death, 323; effect of his death, 324; body exposed at Tyburn, 330; introduces himself to the Duke of York, 379
 Cromwell, Richard, superseded by the Rump, 324
 Crookston Castle, 73
 Culloden, battle of, 520
 Cumberland, William Augustus, Duke of, 515; at Aberdeen, 519; wins Culloden, 520
 Dacre, Lord, at Flodden, 89; offer to Margaret Tudor, 95
 Dairsie, Parliament at, 10
 Dalkeith Castle, attacked by the Earl of Douglas, 49
 Dalkeith Palace, Margaret Tudor at, 80
 Dalnaspidal, battle of, 321
 Dalriadic dynasty, 1
 Dalwhinnie, 500
 Damian, John, 71
 Danby, Sir Thomas Osborne, Lord, chief Minister of Charles II., 356; impeached and imprisoned, 362
 Daniel, Samuel, 220
 Darnley, Henry Stewart, Lord, his meeting with Mary, 129; character, 132; married to Mary, 134; bad relations with her, 137; is denied the crown matrimonial, 137; conspires against Riccio, 139; escapes to Dunbar, 141; declared innocent of the assassination of Riccio, 142; jealousy of Bothwell, 142; desperate situation, 144; assassination, 145; his dead body, 146
 Dartmouth, George Legge, Lord, Admiral, letter of James II. to, 432; fails to intercept Dutch fleet, 434; declines to send the Prince of Wales out of England, 439; final letter of James II. to, 440
 David I., 5

- David II., birth of, 7; removed to France, 9; returns to Scotland, 10; captured at Neville's Cross, 10; ransomed, 11; traitorous tendencies, 11; agrees to acknowledge Edward III. as his successor, 11; death, 12
- Davies, Moll, 340; daughter, 377
- D'Abeville, the Marquis, 432
- D'Arguillon, Duchess of, and Charles II., 319
- D'Avaux, Count, 448, 449
- D'Eguilles, French agent, 513
- De Haro, Don Louis, 325
- Denham, Lady, and James II., 389
- De Pompadour, Madame, 525
- De Rosen, General, 449, 450
- De Talmond, Princess, mistress of Charles Edward, 527, 528, 529
- De Witt, John, murder of, 355
- Donibristle Castle, 174
- Donne, Dr John, promoted Dean of St Paul's, 193; referred to, 220
- Donnington Castle, 270
- Dorchester, Catherine Sedley, Countess of, mistress of James II., quoted, 386, 397; ambitions, 409; created Countess of Dorchester, 413; final relations with James II., 414-15
- Dorset, Lady, governess of Charles, Prince of Wales, 297; in charge of the Duke of York, 378
- Douglas. See also Angus, and Morton
- Douglas, Archibald, brother of the Earl of Morton, recalled, 169
- Douglas, Archibald, Earl of, regent, death of, 45
- Douglas, Catherine, and the murder of James I., 43
- Douglas, Gavin, Bishop of Dunkeld, imprisoned, 96
- Douglas, George, and Mary Queen of Scots, 115, 162
- Douglas, Sir George, flees for his life, 96; in England, 97; quoted, 110
- Douglas, James, eldest son of the 1st Earl of Douglas, his marriage, 13, 22; death at Otterburn, 15
- Douglas, James the Gross, 7th Earl of, 47
- Douglas, James, 9th Earl of, burns Stirling and attacks Dalkeith Castle, 49; attainted and takes refuge in England, 50; sent to St Albans, 54; defeated, 55; captured and confined in Lindores Abbey, 63
- Douglas, Sir James at Bannockburn, 7
- Douglas, Lady Margaret. See Lennox
- Douglas, Sir William, Governor of Lochleven Castle, 150
- Douglas, William, 1st Earl of, opposes David II., 11; demurs to the Stewart succession to the crown, but reconciled by the marriage of Isabel, daughter of Robert II., to his son, 13; mentioned, 22
- Douglas, William, 6th Earl of, execution of, 46
- Douglas, William, 8th Earl of, joins Livingstone against Crichton, 47; his fortress captured, 48; conspires with Crawford against the king, 48; invited to Stirling, 48; assassinated, 49
- Dover, Henrietta Maria lands at, 227; sets sail from, 263; Charles II. lands at, 328; treaty of, 353
- Downs, battle of the, 349
- Drama, the Restoration, 344
- Drogheda, force assembled at, 450
- Drummond, Annabella, wife of Robert III., her children, 26
- Drummond, Lady Margaret, 72, 92
- Drummond, Lord John, arrives at Montrose, 514; joins Charles Edward at Stirling, 517
- Drummond, William, of Hawthornden, 220
- Drury Lane Theatre, 344
- Dryden, John, quoted, 296
- Dubh, Donald, 75-6
- Dublin, James II. makes state entry into, 449; flees to, 451; sets out from, 451
- Duchal Castle captured, 73
- Duddingstone, army of Charles Edward sets out from, 507; army reviewed at, 513
- Dudhope House, Charles II. at, 315
- Dumbarton Castle annexed to the crown, 51; Mary Queen of Scots in, 114
- Dunbar, General Cope lands at, 505
- Dunbar, earldom of, 36
- Dunbar, James Murray, Earl of, tutor to Charles Edward, 483, 489; quoted, 490, 491
- Dunbar, Gavin, tutor of James V., 93
- Dunbar, William, Scottish poet, quoted, 71, 72, 74; his poem in praise of London, 79; celebrates the royal marriage, 80
- Dunbar Castle, fortified by Albany, 63; Mary Queen of Scots escapes

- to, 140; and later elopes with Bothwell to, 147
- Dundalk, General Schomberg at, 450
- Dundee, Assembly at, 177; James Francis Edward at, 473
- Dundee, John Graham, Viscount, interview with James II., 444; death at Killiecrankie, 450
- Dundonald Castle, residence of Robert II., 17, 18
- Dunfermline Palace, birth of James II. in, 27; Charles I. born in, 222
- Dunkirk, Charles II. at, 323; sold to France, 337; surrender of, 385; James Francis Edward at, 472; mentioned, 493, 536
- Duppa, Dr Brian, tutor of the Prince of Wales, 297; of the Duke of York, 378
- Dupplin Moor, defeat of the Earl of Mar at, 8
- Durham, Scots spoil the Episcopalians in, 252
- Dutch War, first, 337, 348-50; second, 355
- Earle, Dr, tutor of Charles, Prince of Wales, 301
- Eastern Association, 269
- Edgehill, battle of, 265; Charles, Prince of Wales and the Duke of York at, 298
- Edinburgh, 10; historic associations of, 101; tumult in, 176; visit of James VI. and I. to, 211; Parliament at, 246; Charles Edward at, 505. See also Holyrood.
- Edinburgh Castle, 24, 45; execution of the Douglasses in, 46; joined to the crown, 51; James III. in, 55; Albany escapes from, 58; James III. in, 61; delivered from, 62; birth of James VI. in, 142; fall of, 153
- Edward I. and the coronation stone, 2
- Edward III. and Scotland, 8-11
- Edward IV., aims, 54; arrogant proposals, 59; ravages Fife and supports Albany against James III., 60; comes to terms with Scotland, 61; death, 63
- Elcho, Lord, quoted, 489; aide-de-camp to Charles Edward, 502; quoted, 506, 509, 512, 513, 516, 520, 521, 530
- Eleanor, Princess, daughter of James I., 44
- Elgin Cathedral, burned by the "Wolf of Badenoch," 23
- Elizabeth, Princess, daughter of Robert I., 22
- Elizabeth, Princess, daughter of Robert III., 26
- Elizabeth, Princess, daughter of James I., 44
- Elizabeth, Princess, daughter of James VI., married to the Elector Palatine, 207, 221
- Elizabeth, Princess, daughter of Charles I., 286, 295
- Elizabeth, Queen, relations with Mary Queen of Scots, 123; arranges for interview with her but postpones it, 125; suggests her marriage to Lord Dudley, created Earl of Leicester, 128; opposes the Darnley marriage, 129; chicanery, 134; deceives Moray, 135; rates him, 136; attitude to Mary, 152; detains her in England, 153; treaty with Charles IX., 154; consents to Mary's execution, 155; attitude to James VI., 165; supports the exiled lords, 167; treats James VI. with contempt, 170; escapes the Armada danger, 171; death, 179, 181; compared with James VI. and I., 192; referred to, 233, 234
- Elphinstone, William, Bishop of Aberdeen, quoted, 58; ambassador to England, 65; proposal to James IV., 86
- Ely, Isle of, 272
- Engagers, the, 305, 315
- Erasmus quoted, 70
- Eriska, Charles Edward at, 496
- Errol, Francis Hay, 9th Earl, signs the "Spanish Blanks," 175
- Erskine, Alexander, tutor of James VI., 160
- Essex, Lady, 206
- Essex, Robert Devereaux, 3rd Earl of, defeated at Edgehill, 266; at Newbury, 269; men capitulate at Fowey peninsula, 270; superseded, 271
- Essex Plot, 179
- Étampes, siege of, 383
- Euirn, Island of, Charles Edward at, 523
- Evelyn, John, quoted, 328, 340, 341, 409, 414, 428
- Ewer, Colonel, removes Charles I. to Hurst Castle, 283
- Exclusion Bill, the, 256, 257, 262, 365, 366, 367

- Fairfax, General Thomas, at Marston Moor, 269; commander-in-chief of new model army, 271; gains the battle of Naseby, 272; orders rendezvous at Newmarket, 278; presents the army remonstrance to the Commons, 283; declines to sit at the trial of Charles I., 284; in the western regions, 300; introduces himself to the Duke of York, 379
- Fairfax, Lord, takes refuge in Hull, 267
- Falkirk, battle of, 6; later battle, 518
- Falkland Palace, James V. dies in, 111; James VI. escapes from, 165
- Falmouth, Earl of, death of, 392
- Faversham, James II. at, 442
- Fécamp, Charles II. lands at, 318
- Fénélon, François de Salignac de La Motte, quoted, 474
- Fenwick, Sir John, privy to the assassination plot, 454
- Ferdinand V. of Spain, and Perkin Warbeck, 77; combines with the Pope and Henry VIII. against France, 84
- Ferdinand of Styria and the Bohemian crown, 213
- Fergus Mor Mac Earca, founder of the Dalriadic dynasty, 2
- Fergusson, Robert, the plotter, quoted, 371
- Ferrarius, quoted, 68
- Ferry Bridge held by General Poyntz, 272
- Fetteresso, James Francis Edward at, 473
- Feversham, Louis Duras, Earl of, commander-in-chief under James II., advises retreat, 437; disbands his troops, 440; sent to protect James II., 442; deputed to announce to the Prince of Orange the return of James to Whitehall, 443; arrested, 444
- Fife, Murdoch, Earl of, in the Tower, 29; released, 29. See Albany
- Fife, Robert, Earl of, guardian of the kingdom under Robert II., 16; also under Robert III., 23; created Duke of Albany, 23. See Albany
- Finch, Heneage, solicitor-general, 405
- Finchley Common, troops assemble on, 515
- Fire, the great, 349
- Fitzalan, Alan, 4
- Fitzalan, Walter, 4, 5
- Fitzalan, William, 5
- Fitz-Flaald, Alan, 5
- Five-Mile Act, the, 337
- Flaald, a knight of Brittany, 4
- Fleance, 3
- Fleming, Lady, governess of Mary Queen of Scots, 115
- Fleming, Malcolm, execution of, 46
- Fleming, Malcolm, 3rd Lord, 96
- Fleming, Sir William, his instructions from Charles II., 310
- Flodden, battle of, 88
- Florence, Charles Edward at, 532, 533; Countess of Albany at, 533
- Fontenay, messenger of Mary Queen of Scots, 168
- Fontarabia, Charles II. at, 325
- Forbes, Lord, in arms at Aberdeen, 73
- Forbes, Lord President, warns the Highland chiefs, 499; quoted, 510
- Ford Castle captured, 87
- Fordoun quoted, 8
- Forman, Bishop of Moray, Scottish ambassador in France, 85
- Fotheringay, execution of Mary Queen of Scots at, 157
- Fourbin, Admiral, 465
- Fowey peninsula, capitulation of Essex at, 270
- Francis I. of France and James V., 94
- Francis II., husband of Mary Queen of Scots, his death, 116
- Franciscans, the, 105
- Franchenthal sequestered, 214
- Frascati, burial of Charles Edward at, 533; Henry Benedict made bishop of, 540; seminary and library at, 541; mentioned, 546
- Frederick V., Elector Palatine, married to the Princess Elizabeth, 207; consequences of the marriage, 208; accepts the Bohemian crown, 213; defeat and flight, 214
- Frederickshall, siege of, 480
- French Marriage Treaty, 216
- French Revolution, the, 190
- Fribourg, mansion-house in, rejected by Charles Edward, 527; Miss Walkinshaw at, 533
- Froissart quoted, 15
- Fyvie, Lord President, in charge of Prince Charles, 222
- Gaeta, siege of, 490
- Galloway, the Fair Maid of, 49; marries the 9th Earl of Douglas, 50
- Gardiner, Colonel James, his dragoons, 503; park wall, 507

- Gardiner, S. R., quoted, 233, 278, 289, 310
- Garmouth-on-Spey, Charles II. lands at, 311
- Geddes, Jenet, in St Giles, 244
- George I. of England, accession of, 469
- George III. suggests a pension to Henry Benedict, 545
- George IV. and the Canova monument, 546
- George, Prince of Denmark, marries the Princess Anne, 401; deserts to the Prince of Orange, 437
- Geraldine, Sir Thomas, his mission to Spain, 495
- Gibbons, Orlando, his carvings in the royal palaces, 345
- Giffard, Hugh de, contracted in marriage to Elizabeth Muir, 19
- Giles, St, Edinburgh, address of James in, 181; the Bishop of Moray preaches in, 243; erected into a cathedral, 243; riot in, 244; present service in, 245
- Gladsmuir, battle of, 508
- Glammis, John, 3rd Lord, at Sauchieburn, 67
- Glammis, Lady, executed, 106
- Glamorgan, Edward Somerset, 2nd Marquis of, agreement of, 273
- Glasgow, Darnley at, 146; Assembly at, 246, 247; Charles Edward at, 517
- Glasgow Cathedral, James IV. swears in it to observe treaty with England, 80
- Glasgow University founded, 52
- Glencairn, Alexander, 5th Earl of, supports Moray against the queen, 134
- Glenmoriston, the seven men of, 525
- Glenshiel, battle of, 481, 500; Charles Edward at, 523
- Gloucester, siege of, 269
- Gloucester, Henry, Duke of, son of Charles I., 286, 295, 385
- Gloucester, the Duke of, son of the Princess Anne, 462
- Godfrey, Sir Edmund Berry, murder of, 361
- Godolphin, Sidney, 1st Earl of, appointed Lord Chamberlain to the queen, 407; his statement in the House of Lords, 445
- Goffe, Dr Stephen, addresses Charles II. as "Your Majesty," 303
- Gondomar, Spanish ambassador, 209, 210
- Gordon, George, 1st Duke of, makes no attempt to reduce Inverness, 473
- Gordon, General, at Montrose, 476
- Gordon, Lady Jean, married to Bothwell, 144; divorced from him, 148
- Gowrie, William Ruthven, 1st Earl, leader of the Ruthven Raiders, 165; executed, 166
- Gowrie Conspiracy, the, 178
- Grafton, Henry, 1st Duke of, rides off to the Prince of Orange, 437
- Graham, Bishop and then Archbishop of St Andrews, deprived of his see, 57
- Graham, Sir John, nominally succeeds Lord Inverness in the counsels of James Francis Edward, 485
- Graham, Sir Robert, imprisoned, 35; liberated, 36; assassinated James I., 42; executed, 43
- Grammont, Count, his *Memoirs*, quoted, 340, 386, 390
- Grand Remonstrance, the, 258; carried, 259; sent to Charles I., 259; published, 260
- Grassmarket, Edinburgh, execution of Montrose at, 310
- Gravesend, James II. at, 444
- Gray, Patrick, supposed assassin of James III., 69
- Gray, Patrick, Master of, his treachery to Mary, 155; effects Arran's overthrow, 168; blamed for the death of Mary, sentenced to death, but pardoned and exiled, 170
- Gray, Sir Thomas, his *Scalachronica*, quoted, 9
- "Great Harry," the, 84
- "Great Michell," the, 84
- Greenwich Observatory, erected by Charles II., 346
- Greenwich Park planted, 345
- Gualterino, Cardinal, named Protector of England, 480
- Gude and Godly Ballatis*, the, 33
- Guest, General, governor of Edinburgh Castle, 504
- Guildford, Lord Keeper, 347; retains the Great Seal under James II. and VII., 407
- Guildres, Mary of, marriage to James II., 48; at Roxburgh Castle, 54; relations with Edward IV., 54; death, 55
- Guise, the Duke of, assassinated, 126
- Guises, the, 116
- Gunpowder Plot, the, 185
- Guthrie, James, executed, 333
- Gwellenborg, Swedish ambassador, arrested, 480

- Gwynne, Nell, and Charles II., 340-1, 368; dying entreaty of Charles on her behalf, 373; children, 377
- Haco of Norway, defeat of, 6
- Haddington, siege of, 113
- Haen, Nicholas, sculptures a tomb for Robert II., 18
- Hales, Sir Edward, accompanies James II. on his flight from Whitehall, 441
- Halifax, George Savile, Viscount, quoted, 346, 347; speeches of, 367; puzzled at the king's apparent indecision, 368; negotiates for the return of Monmouth, 402; Lord President of the Council, 407; deprived of his office, 412; appointed to treat with the Prince of Orange, 439
- Halidon Hill, battle of, 9
- Hall, John, English chronicler, quoted, 78
- Hamilton, Elizabeth, and James II., 389
- Hamilton, Ezekiel, chaplain to James Francis Edward, 479
- Hamilton, James, 1st Lord, with Douglas at Stirling, 49
- Hamilton, James, 2nd Lord. See Arran
- Hamilton, James, 3rd Marquis and 1st Duke of, Commissioner to the Assembly, 246, 247; defeated at Preston, 282
- Hamilton, James Douglas, 4th Duke, 463; killed by Lord Mahon, 466
- Hamilton, Lord John, and Mary Queen of Scots, 152
- Hamilton, Sir James, of Finnart, executed, 106
- Hammond, Colonel, governor of the Isle of Wight, 280
- Hampden, John, 259, 261.
- Hampton Court, conference at, 187; Charles I. at, 279; escapes from, 280
- Hapsburg, the House of, 207
- Harbottle Castle, Margaret Tudor in, 96
- Harrington, Sir John, his *Nugæ*, quoted, 193
- Hatton, Christopher, 1st Lord, quoted, 309
- Hawley, General, defeated at Falkirk, 518
- Hazlerigg, Sir Arthur, impeached, 261
- Hebrides, the, Charles Edward in, 522
- Helvoetsluys, rival fleets at, 302
- Henrietta, Princess, daughter of Charles I., 337, 353, 373; her descendants, 547
- Henrietta Maria, treaty for her marriage to Charles I., 216, 227; her strong Catholic sentiments, 229; quarrels with Charles, 229; final reconciliation, 230; incites him to impeach the five members, 261; sets sail from Dover, 263; advice to Charles, 263; impeached by Pym, 267; successful efforts on behalf of Charles, 267; apprehensions, 269; sets sail for France, 270; children, 295; on the infant Charles, 297; seeks to marry Charles II. to Mademoiselle de Montpensier, 300, 305, 318; disagreement with him, 306; disavows responsibility for his agreement with the Covenanters, 311; on good terms with the Duchess of Cleveland, 339; difficulties with the Duke of York, 380-2; indignant at his marriage, 387; reconciled to it, 388; representations against the Duke exposing himself to danger with the fleet, 393
- Henry IV. of England, 24
- Henry V., his relations with James I., 29, 30
- Henry VI., capture of, 52; in Scotland, 54; goes to Northumberland, 55
- Henry VII., proposed arrangements with James III., 64; bond with Angus, 73; mentioned, 77; gives his daughter Margaret in marriage to James IV., 79; relations with James IV., 81; death of, 82
- Henry VIII., accession of, 81; protects assassins of Sir Robert Ker, &c., 82; combines with the Pope and Spain against France, 82; authorises burial of James IV. in St Paul's, 90; attitude to James V., 94; matrimonial adventures, 96; Scottish intrigues, 98; secret activity against James V., 100; designs against Scotland, 107; marriage disappointment, 108; fails to induce James to a conference, 109; dying injunctions, 112; contrasted with James VI. and I., 192; his relation to Catholicism, 197; referred to, 234
- Henry II. of France, 113
- Henry IV. of France, assassination of, 207

- Henry, Prince, son of James VI. and I., birth, 175; referred to, 177; death, 209; jocular remark, 223
- Henry, Duke of Gloucester, son of Charles I. See Gloucester.
- Henry Benedict, Cardinal York, birth of, 482, 535; adopts the ecclesiastical vocation, 487, 537; sides with the Countess of Albany, 532, 540; characteristics, 535; in Paris, 536; becomes Cardinal, 538; quarrels with his father, 539; made Bishop of Frascati, 540; seeks to win his brother from his intemperate habits, 541; buries him with royal honours at Frascati, 533, 543; on his brother's death asserts a veiled sovereignty, 543; causes medals to be struck, 544; disasters to him through the French Revolution and the invasions of Napoleon, 544; flight to Venice, 545; pensioned by England, 545; returns to Frascati, 546; death and burial, 546; will, 546; character of his life, 547
- Henry, Philip, on the execution of Charles I., 288
- Hepburns, the, in league against James III., 66
- Herbert, Admiral, dismissed by James II., and enters the Dutch service, 428
- Herbert, Sir Edward, and the Duke of York, 381
- Heron, Lady, and James IV., 87
- Hertford, William Seymour, Earl of, at the funeral of Charles I., 293; governor of Charles II., 298
- High Commission, Court of, 239; abolished, 255; revived by James II., 416
- Hippesley, Sir John, action on behalf of Cardinal York, 545
- Hobbes, Thomas, tutor of Charles II., 302
- Hoffmann, Austrian ambassador, quoted, 429, 431, 436, 443
- Holland, Henry Rich., Earl of, 257
- Holles, Denzil, puts resolutions to the Commons, 237; impeached, 261
- Holmsby House, Charles I. at, 276
- Holy League, the, 77, 79
- Holyrood Abbey, James II. crowned in, 45; buried in, 52
- Holyrood Chapel, Mary married to Darnley in, 134
- Holyrood Palace, adornment of its windows, 80; James V. at, 100; Riccio's murder in, 139; Mary married to Bothwell in, 149; convention at, 169; the 5th Earl of Bothwell attempts forcible entry into, 174; Charles Edward in, 505
- Home, Alexander, 3rd Lord, at Flodden, 89; in league with Angus, 95, 96
- Home, John, his *History of the Rebellion*, quoted, 513
- Homes, the, in rebellion against James III., 65
- Homildon, battle of, 25
- Hooke, Nathaniel, Jacobite agent, his reports, 464
- Hopton, Sir Ralph, afterwards Lord, reads the Grand Remonstrance to Charles I., 259; royalist victories of, 266; annihilates Waller's army, 267; defeated at Cheriton, 269
- Hotham, Sir John, in charge of Hull, 263
- Huddleston, Father, his *Short and Plain Way*, 374
- Huguenots, the, take refuge in England, 413
- Hunt, 257; under charge of Sir John Hotham, 263; in possession of the Parliament, 265; Lord Fairfax takes refuge in, 267
- Huntingdon captured by Charles I., 272
- Huntly, Alexander, 3rd Earl of, at Flodden, 89; one of the Council, 94
- Huntly, George, 2nd Earl, at Sauchieburn, 67
- Huntly, George, 4th Earl, 125, 127
- Huntly, George, 5th Earl, freed from imprisonment and opposes Moray, 135; supports Mary, 141; advice to her, 148
- Huntly, George, 6th Earl and 1st Marquis of, against Bothwell, 174; signs the "Spanish Blanks," 175; "wauchting" with the king, 179
- Hyde, Anne, marries the Duke of York, 386; characteristics, 388-9; flirtation with Harry Sidney and conversion to Catholicism, 390; death, 390
- Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon. See Clarendon
- Hyde, Laurence, Viscount Hyde, and later Earl of Rochester. See Rochester
- "Incident," the, 257

- Independents, the, their characteristics, 276
- Indemnity, Charles II. and, 330
- Indulgence, Declaration of, 421, 423
- Innes, Lewis, almoner of Mary of Modena, 480
- Innsbruck, the Princess Sobieski detained at, 480
- Invercarron, defeat of Montrose at, 310
- Inverness, proposed landing at, 465; proposed reduction of, 473; retreat of Cope to, 500; Charles Edward at, 519
- Inverness Castle, joined to the crown, 51
- Inverness, John Hay, titular Earl of, succeeds Mar as secretary of James Francis Edward, 483; nominally superseded, 485; retires to France, 486
- Inverness, Lady, her relations with James Francis Edward, 483, 485
- Ireton, General, his body exposed at Tyburn, 330
- Isles, the, subdued by James IV., 75
- Isles, John, Lord of the, 22
- Isles, Alexander, Lord of the, and James II., 40; submits, 57; death, 75
- Jaffray, Alexander, quoted, 309
- James 3rd, High Steward, 6
- James I. of Scotland, birth, capture, and detention in England, 28; amusements and studies, 28; relations with Henry V., 29; in France with Henry V., 30; released and married to Jane Beaufort, 31; crowned at Scone, 31; his *Kingis Quair*, 31; other poetry, 32; character ■ sovereign, 34; executes Albany and his sons, 36; confiscations, 36; domestic policy, 36; legislation, 37; ecclesiastical relations, 38; magnifies the Parliament, 39; subdues the Highlands, 39; relations with England, 41; at the siege of Roxburgh, 41; dynastic conspiracy against him, 42; assassination, 43; punishment of conspirators, 43; burial, 44; children, 44
- James II., birth, 45; coronation, 45; removed to Stirling Castle, 45; kidnapped by Crichton, 46; married to Mary of Gueldres, 48; strikes the 8th Earl of Douglas with a dagger, 49; routs the 9th Earl, 50; policy towards the Douglasses, 51; death, burial, and children, 52
- James III., birth and coronation, 54; under the governorship of the Boyds, 55; marriage, 56; relations with his brothers, 58; marches south against Edward IV., 60; seized by the nobles at Lauder and sent to Edinburgh Castle, 61; released, 62; marriage proposals with Henry VII., 64; artistic pursuits, 64; rising against him, 66; defeated at Sauchieburn, 67; flight and death, 68; family, 69
- James IV., with the insurgents against his father, 68; birth, character, and pursuits, 70-2; legal reforms, 74; subjugation of the Isles, 75; relations with Warbeck, 77-9; marriage negotiations with Spain, 77; signs a truce with England, 78; contracted in marriage to Margaret Tudor, 79; league with Denmark, 81; remonstrates with Henry VII., 81; difficulties with Henry VIII., 83; anxious for peace but prepares for war, 83; his ships, 84; declares war against England, 85; assembles an army, 86; captures Border strongholds, 87; relations with Lady Heron, 87; on Flodden ridge, 87; defeated, 88; supposed death, 90; fate of his body, 90; children, 92
- James V., birth and coronation, 93; at Stirling, 95; near heirship to the English throne, 96; "erection," 97; the ward of his uncle, 98; in the custody of Angus, 99; escapes to Stirling Castle, 100; character, amusements, &c., 100-2; prosecution of the reivers, 105; action against Lady Glamis, &c., 106; estrangement from Henry VIII., 107; marriage proposals, 107; marries the Princess Madeline and after her death Marie de Guise, 108; swayed by Cardinal Beaton, 108; Solway Moss, 109; retires to Falkland, 110; death, 111; children, 111
- James VI. of Scotland and I. of England, birth, 142, 159; coronation, 159; tutors, governors, and education, 160; a centre of intrigues, 162; scheme for kidnapping him, 162; conveyed to Ruthven Castle, 164; escapes to St Andrews and takes action against the raiders, 165;

- appeals to the Pope for help, 165; relations with the Kirk, 166; reconciled to Arran's overthrow, 168; lack of sympathy with his mother, 169; assents to her execution, 170; attitude to the Armada, 171; married to Anne of Denmark, 172; cordiality between him and the Kirk, 172; ■ witchfinder, 173; difficulties with Bothwell, 173; bad relations with the Kirk, 174; leniency to the Catholic earls, 175; "redds the marches" between himself and the Kirk, 176; his *True Law of Free Monarchies*, and *Basilicon Doron*, 177; the Gowrie Conspiracy, 178; English aspirations, intrigues with the Catholics, and understanding with Cecil, 178; proclamation as sovereign of England, 179; sets out for England, 181; arrives in London, 182; coronation, 183; under the guidance of Cecil, 184; assents to the disgrace of Raleigh, 185; relations with the Catholics, 185; at the Hampton Court Conference, 186; hostile attitude towards Presbyterians and Puritans, 187 *sq.*; personal appearance, 192; conversation and wit, 193; treatises, 194; attitude to the Papacy, 195; to sovereignty, 197; to the Parliament, 199; pecuniary difficulties, 200; love of peace, 200; future influence of his policy, 201; his aim, 202; advocates a union with Scotland, 202; failure of his effort, 203; relations with Bacon, 204; with Carr, 205-6; with Villiers, 207; marriage arrangements for his children, 207; later Spanish marriage project, 209; visit to Scotland, 210; attempt to establish ceremonialism there, 211; Declaration of the Book of Sports, 212; issues *The Peace Maker*, 213; difficulties with the Elector Palatine, 214; assents to the visit of Charles to Madrid, 215; death and burial, 217; results of his Irish, Scottish, and English policies, 218; amusements and accomplishments, 219; literary patronage, 220; works, 220; children, 221; rebuke of Charles and Buckingham, 226; referred to, 233
- James II. of England and VII. of Scotland, as Duke of York at Edgehill, 298; with the English fleet at Helvoetsluys, 302; in Jersey, 307; consulted by Charles II. about ■ Catholic restoration, 354; declines to take the Sacrament, 356, 394; married to Mary of Modena, 356, 395; distributes bribes of Louis XIV., 357; open Catholicism, 360; folly of his conduct, 365; welcome on return from Scotland, 366; again sent to Scotland, 367; reaction in his favour, 371; plot to murder him, 371; restored to the office of Lord High Admiral, 372; statement in proof of his brother's Catholicism, 374; birth, 378; in his father's care, 378; in Oxford, 378; removed to St James's, 379; escapes to the Continent, 380; joins his mother in Paris, 381; described, 381; marriage negotiations, 382; under Turenne, 382; quarrel with his brother, 384; at Dunkirk, 384; return to England, 384; character, 385-6; marriage to Anne Hyde, 387; amours, 389; further amours, 391; interest in the navy, 391; in command against the Dutch, 392; takes the part of Clarendon, 393; resigns his commission, 394; second marriage, 395; agitation against him, 397; goes to the Hague and afterwards to Scotland, 399; policy there, 400; returns to England, 401; enjoys the king's confidence, 402; succeeds to the throne and promises to defend the Church of England, 403; characteristics, 404; lack of candour in his professions, 405; attends mass in public, 407; his chief officers of state, 407; summons a Parliament, 408; coronation, 409; reforms the manners of the Court but retains Catherine Sedley, 409-10; opposes penal laws, 410; relations with Monmouth, 411; seeks to ignore the Test Act, 412; prorogues the Parliament, 413; aids the Huguenot refugees, 413; dangerous position, 413; creates Catherine Sedley Countess of Rochester, 413; final relations with her, 414-15; crazy ecclesiastical crusade, 415; publishes proofs of his brother's Catholicism, 415; browbeats the judges, 415; seeks to officer his army with Catholics, 416; other attempts to advance Catholicism,

- 416-17; Scottish policy, 418; Irish policy, 419; Catholic policy in England, 420 *sq.*; desperate position, 424; birth of a son to him, 424; signs of his jeopardy, 428; declines offer of naval assistance from Louis XIV., 429; self-confidence gives way, 429; consults the bishops and issues a declaration, 430; issues a second one, but without favourable result, 431; recovers his spirits, 432; sends the prince to Portsmouth, 435; sets out to the army, 436; resolves to retreat, 437; deserted by Churchill, Prince George of Denmark, and other officers, 437; hopeless position, 438; agrees to summon a Parliament, but only to gain time, 438; refusal of Dartmouth to send the prince out of England, 440; secures the escape of the queen and the prince, 440; flees from Whitehall, 440; detained by fishermen, who escort him to Faversham, 442; returns to Whitehall, 443; leaves it at the request of the Prince of Orange and goes to Rochester, 444; escapes to France, 445; reaches St Germain's, 446; passive attitude, 446; appeals to the European Powers for help, 447; dependent on Louis XIV., 448; sets sail for Ireland, 449; ineptitude, 450; flees from the Boyne and sets sail for France, 451; failure of expedition on his behalf, 452; makes certain concessions, but plot on his behalf fails, 454; objects to his son's recognition by William III., 455; last years and death, 456; disposal of his remains, 456; characteristics, 457; children, 460
- James Francis Edward (in Jacobite opinion James III. and IX.), Cardinal York, birth, 426, 461; sent to Portsmouth, 435; brought back to London and taken by his mother to France, 439, 461; his recognition as next heir to himself suggested by William III., but objected to by his father and mother, 455; education and characteristics, 461; proclaimed at St Germain's, 462; attainted, 462; sets out with the French fleet for Scotland, 464; returns to Dunkirk and joins the French army in Flanders, 465; negotiations with Queen Anne, 466; strong Catholic sentiments, 468; defective qualities, 469; Bolingbroke's opinion of him, 470; surreptitiously sanctions Mar's rising in the Highlands, 471; joins him, 472; difficulties, 473; disappoints his followers, 474; permits devastation of the country, 475; retreats from Perth and embarks at Montrose for France, 476; at St Germain's, 477; dismisses Bolingbroke, 477; at Avignon, 478; journey to Italy, 479; visits Rome, 479; obtains the ducal palace of Urbino in Italy, 479; falls in love with his cousin, 479; other marriage proposals, 480; proceeds to Spain, 481; marriage, 482; deserted by his wife, 483; outwardly reconciled with her, 485; disappointments and sorrows, 486; death and burial, 487; letter to Charles Edward, 538
- Jeffreys, Sir George, Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, made joint-Keeper of the Great Seal, 407; his solemn assertion, 411
- Jennings, Francis, and the Duke of York, 389
- Jersey, Charles II. in, 300; his second visit to, 307
- Joan, Princess, daughter of James I., 44
- John the Baptist, apparition of, 86
- Johnstone, Sir Archibald, of Warriston, execution of, 333
- Johnstone, the Chevalier, quoted, 501
- Jonson, Ben, and James VI. and I., 220
- Juan, Don, the victor of Lepanto, 154
- Julius, Pope, and James IV., 82; action against France, 83; death, 84
- Juxon, Dr, Bishop of London, assists Charles I. in his devotions, 286; at his funeral, 294
- Kelso, coronation of James III. at, 54
- Kennedy, Bishop, chancellor, 47; compact with Crichton against Douglas and Livingstone, 47; founds St Salvator's College, St Andrews, 52; regent, 54; death, 55
- Ker, John, of Kersland, 464
- Ker, Sir Robert, murder of, 82
- Ker, Sir Robert, poet, 220
- Killiecrankie, death of Dundee at, 450

- Killiegrew, Elizabeth, mistress of Charles II., 323; her daughter, 376
- Killigrew, Henry, English ambassador, quoted, 161
- Killigrew, Henry, D.D., chaplain to the Duke of York, 381
- Kinloss, the Abbot of, ambassador of James VI., 179
- Kinsale, James II. lands at, 449; sails from, 451
- Kirkcaldy, Sir William, of Grange, supports Moray's rebellion, 134
- Kirk-o'-Field, murder of Darnley at, 146
- Kirke, Colonel Percy, at Warminster, 436
- Kirke, Moll, and the Duke of York, 396
- Knox, John, quoted, 110; characteristics and achievement, 118-20; opposes Mary's Mass, 121; not impressed with the plea of Moray, 122; on Elizabeth and the Darnley marriage, 130; ineffectiveness of his thunders, 135; James VI. denounces his version of Mary's story, 160; his political aspirations, 166
- Kyle, Stewart, 5
- La Hogue, battle of, 453
- Lambert, General, his victory at Nantwich, 325; opposes the Rump, 325; deserted by his men, 326
- Lang, Andrew, quoted, 53, 376, 529
- Langholm, the Douglasses defeated at, 50
- Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 240; his policy, 241; connection with the Scottish liturgy, 243; impeached and imprisoned, 254; tried and executed, 271; baptises Charles, Prince of Wales, 297; and James, Duke of York, 378
- Lauder Bridge, executions at, 61
- Lauzun, General, 451, 452
- Lawson, Professor, quoted, 32
- Legge, William, accompanies Charles I. to the Isle of Wight, 280.
- Leicester, stormed by Charles I., 272
- Leicester, Robert Dudley, Earl of, proposed husband for Mary Queen of Scots, 178
- Lely, Sir Peter, patronised by Charles II., 345
- Lennox, Lady Margaret Douglas, Countess of, mother of Darnley, birth, 96; mentioned, 129; secures the support of Morton, 134
- Lennox, Lord, in arms in the west of Scotland, 73
- Lennox, Earl and Duke of. See Stuart, Esmé
- Lennox, Matthew, 3rd Earl of, 129, 145, 147; shot by the Hamiltons, 159
- Lercari, the Abbé John, and the Cardinal York, 539
- Leslie, Alexander, Covenanting general, 247; on Dunse Law, 248; crosses the Tweed, 269; at Marston Moor, 269
- Leslie, Charles, nonjuror, letter on James Francis Edward, 467; at Avignon, 479
- Leslie, David, General, at Marston Moor, 269; overwhelms Montrose, 273; receives Charles I., 275; at Worcester, 317
- Leslie, John, Bishop, quoted, 68, 87, 89, 91, 101, 103; despatches of, 154; reinstated in his temporalities, 171
- Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre, 344
- Lindores Abbey, the 9th Earl of Douglas in, 63
- Lindsay, David, 2nd Lord, at Sauchieburn, 67
- Lindsay, David, Bishop of Ross, 222
- Lindsay, Patrick, 6th Lord, supporter of Darnley, 135
- Lindsay. See also Lyndsay
- Lindsey, Robert Bertie, Earl of, at the funeral of Charles I., 293
- Linlithgow, battle at, 99; James VI. removes to, 176; dragoons at, 504.
- Linlithgow Palace, evensong in, 86; Mary born in, 112
- Liria, Duke of, son of the Duke of Berwick, at Gaeta, 490
- Livingstone, Sir Alexander, governor of Stirling Castle, besieges Edinburgh Castle, 45; places the queen-dowager in ward, 45; conspires with Crichton to execute the young Douglasses, 46; joins William, 8th Earl of Douglas, against Crichton, 47; attainted and imprisoned, 48
- Livingstone, John, Covenanting clergyman, quoted, 309
- Lloyd, or Floyd, groom of the chamber to James Francis Edward, 468
- Lloyd, David, quoted, 374
- Lochiel. See Cameron
- Lochleven Castle, Mary sent to, 150; escapes from, 152

- Lochmaben, Douglas defeated at, 63
 Lockhart, George, of Carnwath, statements of, 464; his suggestions, 482; mentioned, 483; quoted, 484
 Londonderry, siege of, raised, 450
 Long, Secretary, his notes about Montrose, 310
 Long Marston, Charles II. at, 318
 Longueville, Duc de, his daughter and the Duke of York, 382
 Lorraine, the Cardinal of, 116, 117, 127
 Lorraine, Duc de, and James Francis Edward, 467
 Loudon, Lord, driven out of Ross-shire, 519
 Louis XII. of France and the Pope, 83; death of, 94
 Louis XIV., bribes Charles II., 337, 348; sides with the Dutch, 348; concludes the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, 352; Catholic treaty with Charles II., 353; seeks to bribe the Commons, 357; chagrin at marriage of the Prince of Orange, 358; agrees to the Peace of Nimeguen, 359; reveals Danby's letters, 362; supplies Charles II. with money, 370; advises James II. not to summon a Parliament, 408; sends holy oil for the anointing of James II., 409; offers James II. naval assistance, 429; attitude to James II., 447; advice to him, 448; declines to send expedition to England, 452; agrees to a new invasion scheme, 452; which is frustrated, 453; informs James II. of his purpose to recognise the Prince of Wales, 456; sends expedition to Scotland, 464; death of, 471
 Louis XV., decides on a Jacobite expedition, 491; relations with Charles Edward, 525; sends him to Vincennes, 526; suggests that Charles should marry, 531; his reception of Henry Benedict, 536
 Louis XVI., his execution, 288
 Louisa, daughter of James II., 457; referred to, 460
 Lovat, Simon Fraser, Lord, 463; his recommendation, 498; permits his clan, against his will, to join Charles Edward, 512
 Lumley, Lord, son of the Earl of Clarendon, rides off to the Prince of Orange, 436
 Lyle, Lord, in arms in the west of Scotland, 73
 Lyndsay, Sir David, attendant of James V., 93; dismissed, 98; his regrets, 102; his *Pleasant Satyre* patronised by James V., 105
 M'Alpine, Kenneth, 3
 Macaulay, Thomas, Lord, quoted, 409, 415, 421
 Macbeth, his "inglorious end," 3
 Macdonald, Alexander, of Boisdale, and Charles II., 496
 Macdonald, Sir Alexander, of Sleat, opposed to a rising in the Highlands, 496; refuses to join Charles Edward, 512
 Macdonald, Flora, and Charles Edward, 522
 Macdonald of Glengarry, John, and Charles Edward, 497
 Macdonald of Kinlochmoidart and Charles Edward, 496
 MacEachain, Neil, guide of Charles Edward, quoted, 523
 Macerata, marriage of Charles Edward at, 531
 Macleod of Macleod, opposed to the Highland rising, 496; refuses to join Charles Edward, 512
 Macpherson, Cluny, quoted, 498; his cave in Benalder, 525
 Madeline of France, the Princess, marries James V. and dies shortly afterwards, 108
 Mahon, Lord, kills the Duke of Hamilton in a duel, 466
 Main Plot, the, 184
 Maitland, Sir John, made chancellor, 171; hated by Bothwell, 174; death, 175
 Maitland, William, of Lethington, secretary to Mary Queen of Scots; the constringer of Moray, 122; ambassador to England, 125; supports the marriage to Don Carlos, 126; his opinion as to Mary's purposes, 128; again ambassador to London, 129; soothes and advises Mary, 130; superseded by Riccio, 138; suggests the Norfolk marriage, 153
 Major, John, quoted, 32, 37
 Malines, Treaty of, 84
 Malmaison, James Francis Edward at, 477
 Man, Isle of, ceded to the Scottish Crown, 6
 Manchester, Edward Montague, Earl

- of, impeached, 261; in command in Lincolnshire, 270; indecisive action of, 270; superseded, 271
- Mann, Horace, quoted, 487
- Mansuete, Father, secretly anoints James II. as sovereign, 409
- Mar, Donald, Earl of, defeated and slain at Dupplin Moor, 8
- Mar, John, Earl of, brother of James III., his imprisonment and death, 58
- Mar, John Erskine, 6th Earl of, regent, death of, 160
- Mar, John Erskine, 7th Earl of, ambassador to England, 179
- Mar, John Erskine, 11th Earl of, at Braemar, 471; meets James Francis Edward at Fetteresso, 473; devastates the country, 475; retreats from Perth and escapes to France, 476; blames Bolingbroke for his mishaps, 477; succeeds him as secretary, 478; quoted, 479; treachery and dismissal, 482
- Mar, Lady, governess of James VI., 166
- Mardike, assault on, 323
- Margaret, Princess, daughter of Robert II., married to John, Lord of the Isles, 22
- Margaret, Princess, daughter of James I., married to the Duke of Orleans, afterwards Louis XI., 44
- Margaret, Princess, daughter of James II., 53
- Margaret Tudor, her marriage to James IV., 79-80; regent of the kingdom, 93; marries Angus, 95; goes to England, 96; returns to Scotland, 96; rupture with Angus, 97; brings her son to Edinburgh, 97; passion for Henry Stewart, 98; divorced from Angus, 99; puts away Stewart and is in concord with Angus, 99-100; marries Stewart, 100
- Margaret of Anjou, her relations with Scotland, 55
- Margaret of Denmark, married to James III., 56
- Marie de Bourbon and James V., 108
- Marie de Guise, married to James V., 108; birth of her daughter Mary, 112; arranges for Mary's transference to France, 113; mentioned, 118
- Marischal, George Keith, 10th Earl, 473; routed at Glenshiel, 481
- Marischal, William, 2nd Earl of, at Sauchieburn, 67
- Marischal, William, 3rd Earl, in charge of the royal children, 96
- Marjory, Princess, daughter of Robert II., 26
- Marlborough, John Churchill, afterwards Duke of, supposed plot to seize James II., 436; deserts to the Prince of Orange, 437; communications with the Jacobites, 452
- Marston Moor, battle of, 269
- Mary of Gueldres, married to James II., 48
- Mary of Modena, married to the Duke of York, 355, 395; her secretary, Coleman, 360; unhappiness, 396; birth of her son, 424; circumstances of the birth, 425; letter to the Princess of Orange, 427; escapes to France, 440; arrival at St Germain, 446; lament of, 452; objects to her son's recognition as heir of William III., 453; deprived of her pension, 455; visited by her son, 477; death, 480
- Mary Queen of Scots, birth, 112; affianced to the Dauphin, 112; youthful years in Scotland, 114; lands in France, 114; characteristics, 114; education, 115; married to the Dauphin, 116; his death, 116; negotiations for marriage to Don Carlos frustrated by Catherine de Medicis, 117; returns to Scotland, 117; relations with Elizabeth, 123; Don Carlos' proposals, 125; distrustful of Elizabeth, 125; Don Carlos proposals fail, 127; proposed marriage to Darnley, 129; position of, 131; wrath against Moray, 132; married to Darnley, 134; her supporters, 134; triumph, 136; position, 137; quarrel with Darnley, 138; relations with Riccio, 138; professes to pardon his assassins, 140; escapes to Dunbar, 141; again triumphs, 141; birth of James VI., 142; relations with Bothwell, 143; difficulties with Darnley, 144; implicated in his murder, 145; letters to Bothwell, 146; mock seizure by Bothwell, 148; marriage to him, 148; separated from him at Carberry, 149; sent to Lochleven, 150; demits her crown, 151; causes of her overthrow, 152; escapes from

- Lochleven, 153; a prisoner in England, 153; schemes and conspiracies, 154; sends presents to her son, 161; sends Fontenay to him, 165; deserted by him, 155, 169; trial, 155; execution, 156; character, 156; burial, 157; letters and poems, 157
- Mary, Princess, daughter of Robert II., 22
- Mary, Princess, daughter of Robert III., 26
- Mary, Princess, daughter of James I., 44
- Mary, Princess, daughter of James II., married to Thomas Boyd, and afterwards to John, Lord Hamilton, 53, 56, 57
- Mary, Princess, daughter of Charles I., married to William, Prince of Orange, 295, 321, 387
- Mary, Princess, daughter of James II., married to William, Prince of Orange, afterwards William III., 358; her father's efforts to convert her to Catholicism, 424; doubts her brother's legitimacy, 426; her reply to the queen's letter, 428
- Massacre, the, of Irish Protestants, 258
- Mazarin, Cardinal, 300, 305; procures money for Charles II., 320; at Fontarabia, 325; advice about the Duke of York, 382; arrangement with Cromwell, 384; on the Duke of York's marriage, 388
- Mazarin, Hortense Mancini, Duchess of, 341
- Melani, the Abbé, quoted, 446, 450
- Melfort, John Drummond, Lord, 417, 450
- Melville, Andrew, his metaphors, 163; aspirations, 166; exiled, 167
- Melville, James, quoted, 161; letter of, 169
- Melville, Sir James, ambassador to Elizabeth, 128, 129
- Mendoza, Spanish ambassador, 164, 171
- Middelburg, Charles II. at, 321
- Middlesex, Lionel Cranfield, Earl of, impeachment of, 226
- Middleton, Charles, Earl of, 445, 485
- Middleton, Sir Thomas, defeated at Nantwich, 325
- Middleton, Viscount, defeated at Dalnaspidal, 321
- Milton, John, his ideas of toleration, 236; of Presbyterianism, 256
- Milton, the miller of, 68
- Modena, James Francis Edward at, 479
- Monk, General George, sides with the Rump, 326; directs them to meet with the excluded members, 326; meets Charles II. at Dover, 328; created Duke of Albemarle, &c., 330; sea action, 349
- Monmouth, James, Duke of, 303, 339; succession to Charles II. proposed, 363; attitude of Charles to him, 365, 369; intrigue with Moll Kirke, 396, made to retire to the Continent, 399; failure of his expedition and his treatment of James II., 411
- Montague, Richard, his *Appello Ccesarem*, 231, 233
- Montefiascone, the Bishop of, marries James Francis Edward, 482; baptises Charles Edward, 489
- Montgomerie, Alexander, 161
- Monteruel, French agent, his negotiations with the Scots, 274-5
- Montpensier, Mademoiselle de, and Charles II., 300, 305, 319; on the Duke of York, 381; mounts the Bastille, 383
- Montrose, Assembly at, 178; James Francis Edward at, 476; French vessels at, 511; Lord John Drummond at, 514
- Montrose, James, 1st Marquis of, joins the royalists, 257; victories in Scotland, 272; defeat at Philiphaugh, 273; made Governor-General of Scotland by Charles II., 304; empowered to raise troops, 305; directed by Charles to proceed to Scotland, 307-8; defeat and execution, 310
- Moray, the Earl of, joint regent of Scotland, 10
- Moray, the "Bonnie Earl" of, murder of, 174
- Moray, Lord James Stewart, afterwards Earl of, invites Mary to Scotland, 121; sanctions her use of the Mass, 122; devious action, 122; created Earl of Mar and then Earl of Moray, 127; favours the Spanish marriage, 127; opposes the marriage to Darnley, 128; deceived by Elizabeth and takes refuge in England, 135; returns to Scotland, 140; interview with his sister, 140; reconciled to her, 141; leaves Scotland, 147; returns and acts ■ regent, 151

- Moray, Sir Robert, President of the Royal Society, 346
- Moray, the Bishop of, preaches in St Giles clad in a rochet, 243
- Morton, James Douglas, 6th Lord Dalkeith, created Earl of, 51
- Morton, James, 7th Earl of, supports Darnley, 134; at the assassination of Riccio, 139; flees to England, 141; returns, 145; executed, 154, 163
- Moteville, Madame de, on Charles II., 301
- Moulin, Nicolo, quoted, 192
- Mousson, siege of, 383
- Muir, Elizabeth, contracted to Hugh de Giffard, 18; her marriage to Robert the Stewart (Robert II.), 18, 19; children, 22
- Münster, the Bishop, 348
- Mure, Sir William of Rowallan, quoted, 20
- Murray, Anne, afterwards Lady Halkett, aids the escape of the Duke of York, 379
- Murray, John, of Broughton, 496; his affirmation, 497; mentioned, 502
- Murray, Lord George, joins Charles Edward, 500; made lieutenant-general, 501; suspected by Charles Edward, 502; attempts to surprise dragoons, 504; occupies Carberry Hill, 507; advises night attack, 508; opposed to the march into England, 513; induces Charles to adopt the western route, 514; feint movement on Congleton, 515; advises retreat to Scotland, 516; sally against Cumberland's dragoons, 516; at Falkirk, 518; against fighting on the open plain at Culloden, 519; proposed night attack, 520; orders of Charles to, after Culloden, 521
- Murray, Mrs. of Broughton, at the Cross of Edinburgh, 506
- Murray, Will, secret envoy of Argyll, 305
- Musgrave, Giles, deceives James IV., 88
- Muti Palace, Rome, residence of James Francis Edward, 482; birth of Charles Edward in, 489; birth of Henry Benedict in, 535; Henry receives the tonsure in, 538
- Nantes, edict of, 413
- Nantwich, battle of, 325
- Naples, Cardinal York flees to, 545
- Napoleon, the Emperor, invades Italy, 544
- Naseby, battle of, 272; documents found at, 273
- Nesbit Moor, battle of, 25
- Netherlands, French invasion of the, 352
- Neville's Cross, battle of, 10
- Newark, surrender of, 275
- Newbury, battle of, 269
- Newcastle, 269, 270
- Newcastle, William Cavendish, Earl of and afterwards Duke, appointed Governor of Hull, 263; victories of, 266; shuts himself up in York, 269; governor of Prince Charles, 297; paper of instructions for Prince Charles, 298
- Newmarket, Charles II. at, 343
- New Model Army, the, 270, its backbone, 277; in disagreement with the Parliament, 278; negotiations with the king, 279; its supremacy, 282; intention towards the king, 282; purges the Commons, 284
- Newport, Treaty of, 283
- Newton Butler, battle of, 450
- Nicholas, Sir Edward, quoted, 302; letter of Charles II. to, 315; secretary, 320
- Nimeguen, Peace of, 359
- Non-resistance Bill, the, 356
- Norfolk, Thomas, 4th Duke, his proposed marriage to Mary Queen of Scots, 153; rebellion and death, 154
- Norham Castle captured, 87
- Norris, Sir John, Admiral, bars the French fleet, 493
- North, the Council of the, 239
- North Uist, Charles Edward at, 522, 523
- Northumberland, Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of, 257; in charge of the Duke of York, 379
- Nottingham, Charles I. sets up his standard at, 265
- Nottingham, Daniel Finch, Earl of, quoted, 435; appointed to treat with the Prince of Orange, 439; quoted, 442
- Nuncio, the Papal, his reception at Windsor, 423
- Oates, Titus, his campaign of mendacity, 360 sq.; denounces the Duke of York, 397

- Ochiltree, Andrew Stewart, 2nd Lord, supports Moray, 123
- Octavians, the, 175
- Opdam, Admiral, 392
- Orange, William, Prince of, 267, 309; death of, 321
- Orange, William, Prince of, afterwards William III. of England, 355; marries Mary, daughter of the Duke of York, 358; attitude to James Francis Edward, 427; resolves on expedition to England, 431; lands in Devon, 433; declines conference with James II. and requests him to leave London, 444; accession to the English throne, 447; wins the battle of the Boyne, 451; plot against him, 454; suggests recognition of James Francis Edward as his successor, 455; death, 462
- Orkney and Shetland united to Scotland, 56
- Orleans, the Duke of, married to the Princess Henrietta, 337
- Ormond, Hugh, Earl of, 49; captured, 50
- Ormonde, James, 12th Earl and 1st Duke of, his prospects in Ireland shattered by Cromwell, 307; made Lord Stewart, 330; recalled from Ireland, 419
- Ormonde, James, 2nd Duke of, deserts to the Prince of Orange, 437; unsuccessful expedition on behalf of James Francis Edward, 472; mentioned, 478; failure of his expedition to England, 482
- O'Sullivan, Quartermaster of Charles Edward, 502, 521, 522
- Otterburn, battle of, 15
- Overbury, Sir Thomas, 206, 210
- Oxford, Charles I. at, 266; conference at, 266; Charles takes refuge in, 273; leaves it, 275; royalist Parliament in, 299; Parliament of Charles II. at, 368-9; parliamentary army enters, 379
- Oxford, Robert Harley, Earl of, 467
- Paisley, Abbey of, 5; burial of Robert III. in, 25
- Parma, Dukes of, 547
- Paroy, Madame de, 115
- Paterson, Sir Hugh, 530
- Paulet, Sir Amyas, keeper of Mary Queen of Scots, 155
- Peblis to the Play*, 33
- Peg, Catherine, 323, 377
- Pendennis Castle, Charles II. in, 300
- Pepys, Samuel, quoted, 338, 339, 342, 345, 346, 349, 388, 389, 390, 393, 394; Secretary of the Navy under James II., 407; mentioned, 440
- Perth, surrender of, 10; battle of the clans at, 23; James I. murdered at, 43; Assembly at, 212; Five Articles of, 212, 242, 246; James Francis Edward at, 474; Charles Edward at, 498; sets out from, 502
- Perth, James Drummond, Earl of, 417
- Perth, James Drummond, titular Duke of, 497; lieutenant-general to Charles Edward, 501
- Peterhead, James Francis Edward lands at, 472
- Peterborough, Lady, 389
- Peterborough Cathedral, Mary Queen of Scots buried in, 157
- Peterborough, the Earl, marriage envoy, 395
- Petre, Father, proposed cardinal's hat for, 420; relations with James II., 422
- Philip II. of Spain and Mary Queen of Scots, 117, 127, 153; his Armada, 171
- Philiphauth, defeat of Montrose at, 273
- Pinkie Cleugh, battle of, 112, 507
- Piozzi, Mrs, quoted, 533
- Pisaro, James Francis Edward at, 479
- Pitscottie, Robert Lyndsay of, quoted, 58, 61, 64, 65, 67, 68, 85, 86, 87, 102, 110
- Plague, the, in London, 349
- Portsmouth, James Francis Edward sent to, 435
- Portsmouth, Louise de Kerouaille, Duchess of, 340; indicted by Shaftesbury, 367; bribed by Shaftesbury, 368; enjoys the political confidence of Charles II., 372; dying solicitude of Charles for, 373; her son, 377
- Poyntz, General, at Ferry Bridge, 272; attacked by Charles I., 273
- Preston, battle of, 282; Jacobite calamity at, 473
- Prestonpans, battle of. See Gladsmuir
- Pryde, Colonel, purges the Commons, 349
- Pularoon islands, the, 349
- Pym, John, sways the Commons, 250; draws up a petition for a Parliament, 251; opposes grant of forces to

- Charles I., 251; impeached, 261;
impeaches the queen, 267
- Quadruple Alliance, the, 349
- Quair, the Kingis*, 31
- Queensberry, William Douglas, Duke
of, 417
- Quesnow, siege of, 383
- Raleigh, Sir Walter, disgrace of, 184;
execution, 210
- Ramsay, Sir John, created Earl of
Bothwell, his embassy to England,
65; in treasonable relations with
Henry VII., 73; statements as Eng-
lish spy, 78
- Ramsay the Chevalier, quoted, 489
- Randolph, English ambassador, quoted,
160
- Ratcliffe, Sir George, governor of the
Duke of York, 379, 381
- Rè, Isle of, expedition to, 231
- Remonstrants, the, 315
- Reresby, Sir John, quoted, 338, 343,
367, 368, 385, 428, 439
- Rescission, Act of, 333
- Resolutioners, the, 315
- Revocation, Act of, 242
- Riccio, David, secretary to Mary
Queen of Scots, 138; assassinated,
139
- Rich, Colonel, his regiment of horse,
284
- Richard III. of England, as Duke of
Gloucester at the siege of Berwick,
60; gets rid of Albany, 63; defeat
and death, 64
- Richmond, James Stewart, Duke of,
at the funeral of Charles I., 293;
married to Frances Stewart, 340
- Riddel, Robert, quoted, 21
- Ridolfi Conspiracy, the, 154
- Ripon, negotiations at, 252
- Rizzini, quoted, 446, 452
- Robarts, Lady, and James II., 389
- Robert the Bruce (Robert I. of Scot-
land). See Bruce
- Robert, 5th High Steward, afterwards
Robert II. of Scotland, birth of, 7;
opposes Baliol, 9; joint regent with
Moray, 10; liberates Scotland from
Baliol, 10; rises against David II.
but takes oath of fealty, 11; acces-
sion, 12; coronation, 13; nominates
his son the Earl of Carrick as heir,
13; his difficulties, 14; peaceful
tendencies, 14; retirement to Rothe-
say and Dundonald, 17; death and
burial, 18; marriage to Elizabeth
Muir, 19; marriage to Euphemia
Ross, 21; children, 21
- Robert III. (John, Earl of Carrick),
nominated heir to the crown, 13;
crowned, 22; merely titular
sovereign, 23; death and burial,
25; children, 26
- Rochester, James II. at, 444; escapes
from, 445
- Rochester, Laurence Hyde, Viscount
Hyde, and afterwards Earl of, sent
■ messenger to the Duke of York,
400-1; Lord of the Treasury, 407;
and the Countess of Dorchester,
414; vain attempts of James to
convert him, 419
- Ronsard, quoted, 101
- Root-and-Branch Bill, 256, 257
- Roscoff, Mary disembarks at, 114;
Charles Edward lands at, 525
- Ross, earldom of, annexed to the
crown, 57
- Ross, Euphemia, married to Robert
II., 21; children, 21
- Roths, Andrew, 4th Earl of, supports
Moray, 134
- Roths, John, 6th Earl of, death of,
257
- Rothesay, Robert II. at, 17
- Rothesay, David, Duke of, character
of his rule, 24; death, 26
- Round, Mr J. H., quoted, 4
- Roxburgh, Lady, 297
- Royal Society, foundation of the, 346
- Rowton, battle at, 273
- Rue St Jacques, Convent of, 456
- Rump, the, ousts Richard Cromwell,
325; suspended by Lambert, 325;
supported by Monk, who, however,
directs them to meet with the
excluded members, 336; expiry, 337
- Rupert, Prince, at Edgehill, 266; de-
feated at Marston Moor and retires to
Lancashire, 269; at Naseby, 272; sur-
renders Bristol, 272; sea action, 349
- Russel, Admiral, discontented, 452;
defeats Tourville, 453
- Ruthal, Bishop of Durham, quoted,
87, 89
- Ruthven, Raid of, 164
- Ruthven, Patrick, 3rd Lord, supports
Darnley, 135; at the assassination
of Riccio, 139; flees to England, 141
- Rye House Plot, 371, 401
- Ryswick, Peace of, 455

- St Andrews, James I. at, 27; Paul Crawar executed at, 38; foundation of St Salvator's College, 52; James VI. escapes to, 165; Assembly at, 212
- St Germain's, arrival of James II. at, 446; its gloom during his residence, 455; death of James II. at, 455; precordia deposited in the parish church of, 457; James Francis Edward proclaimed at, 462
- St James's, birth of Charles II. at, 296; birth of James II. at, 378; escape of James II. from, 379; birth of James Francis Edward at, 426
- St Omer, English college at, entrails of James II. bequeathed to, 457
- St Peter's, Rome, burial of James Francis Edward in, 487; of Charles Edward in, 533; of Cardinal York in, 546
- St Sebastian, fall of, 482
- Salisbury, Robert Cecil, 1st Earl, arranges for the proclamation of James VI. of England as king, 179; entrusted with chief management of affairs, 184; created Lord Cecil of Essendon and later Earl of Salisbury, 184; responsible for disgrace of Raleigh, 184; death, 204
- Sandwich, the Earl of, death of, 393
- Sarsfield, General, abandons Sligo, 450
- Saxe, Marshal, failure of his expedition, 493
- Schevas, favourite of James III., made Archbishop of St Andrews, 57
- Schomberg, General, lands in Ireland and drills his troops, 450
- Scone, coronation stone of, 2; coronation of Robert III. at, 13; burial at, 18; coronation of James I. at, 34; coronation of Charles II. at, 316; visited by James Francis Edward, 474; and by Charles Edward, 507
- Scott, Reginald, his *Discovery of Witchcraft*, 173
- Seaforth, Earl of, 473
- Security, Act of, 463
- Self-denying Ordinance, the, 270
- Settlement, Act of, 462
- Séigné, Madame de, quoted, 446, 451
- Shaftesbury, Ashley Cooper, Earl of, one of the Cabal, 341; creates the Whig party, 356; opposes the Non-resistance Bill, 356; sent to the Tower, 357; supports Titus Oates, 361; drops attempt to divorce the queen, 364; spreads story of Monmouth's legitimacy, 366; accuses the Duke of York and the Duchess of Portsmouth, 367; bribes her, 368; patronage of Monmouth, 369; escapes to Holland, 371
- Shakespeare, William, and James VI. and I., 219
- Sheldon, Mrs, nurse of Charles Edward, 483, 489
- Shere, Sir Henry, quoted, 435, 448
- Sheridan, Sir Thomas, governor of Charles Edward, 489; accompanies him to Scotland, 495; quoted, 518; sent with conditions to the generals, 519
- Sheriffmuir, battle of, 473
- Ship-money Tax, 238
- Sidney, Harry, and Anne Hyde, 390
- Simons, Father, and James II., 394
- Sinclair, Oliver, 109
- Skeat, Professor, quoted, 32
- Skelton, Colonel Bevil, English ambassador at Paris, recalled by James II. and sent to the Tower, 429
- Skye, Charles Edward in, 522
- Sligo abandoned, 450
- Sobieski, Prince James, 480
- Sobieski, Princess. See Clementina
- Sobieski Stuarts, the brothers, 534
- Solway Moss, 110
- Somerled, Lord of the Isles, 6
- Somerset, Earl of. See Carr
- Somerset, Duke of, brutalities of, 112
- Sophia, the Electress, her recognition in the succession, 462
- Southampton, Henry Wriothesley, Earl of, at the funeral of Charles I., 293; Lord Treasurer, 320
- Southesk, Lady, 389
- South Sea Bubble, 482
- Southwold Bay, battle of, 392-3
- "Sports, the liberty of," 213
- Spa, Charles II. at, 321
- "Spanish Blanks," the, 175
- Spanish marriage, the, 208, 209, 214-16
- Spottiswoode, Archbishop, 211; made President of the Exchequer, 242
- Star Chamber, the, 239; abolished, 255
- "Start, The," 315
- Stewart, Alexander, the "Wolf of Badenoch," 16, 22; his ruthless savagery, 23
- Stewart, Frances and Charles II., 340

- Stewart, Lord James. See Moray.
- Stewart, Sir James, the Black Knight of Lorn, marries the Queen-Dowager, 45
- Stewart, Sir Robert, treachery of, 43
- Stewarts, ancestral origin of in the female line, 1-2; in the male line, 36
- Stuart, Esmè, Lord of Aubigny, arrival in Scotland, 162; created Earl of Lennox, 162; professes Protestantism while in the confidence of the Catholics, 163; plots against Morton, 163; created Duke, 163; supports Catholics, 164; proceeded against by the Assembly, 164; flight and death, 164
- Stirling, taken by the Steward, 10; execution at, 35; the castle held by Livingstone, 45; James II. brought to, 45; Douglas assassinated in the castle, 49; town burned by his brother, 49; joined to the crown, 51; coronation of James V. at, 93; James V. at, 95; James V. escapes to, 100; Darnley at baptism of James VI. at, 145, 159; Mary at, 147; James VI. crowned in the parish church of, 159; Lennox shot in the streets of, 159; Gowrie beheaded at, Arran escapes from, 168; passed by Charles Edward, 503; castle besieged by him, 517
- Stirling of Keir and the assassination of James III., 69
- Stirling, Sir William Alexander, Earl of, 220
- Stolberg, the Princess of, 531
- Stow, John, quoted, 90
- Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of, his counsel to the king, 249; further advice, 250, 252; trial and condemnation, 253
- Straiton, Captain, Jacobite agent, 477
- Stratharick, Charles Edward in, 521
- Strathearn, Malise Graham, Earl of, sent as hostage to England, 36; released, 50
- Strode, William, impeached, 261
- Sunderland, Robert Spencer, Earl of, secretary, 407; impeached, 412
- Surrey, the Earl of, 87; victor at Flodden, 88
- Talla Moss, 73
- Tangier, 337
- Temple, Sir William, quoted, 347
- Tencin, Cardinal, 537
- Terriesi, Tuscan ambassador, quoted, 413
- Test Acts, 355
- Theiner, quoted, 19
- Thirty Years' War, the, 208; beginning of, 213
- Thorrssen, Anne, and Bothwell, 143
- Tod, Sir Thomas, his treacherous agreement, 73
- Torbay, Dutch disembark at, 433
- Tory Party, beginning of the, 356
- Tourville, Admiral, defeat of, 453
- Tower, the, James I. in, 29; secured for the Parliament, 257, 265
- Tower Hill, Norfolk executed at, 154; Laud executed at, 271
- Tranent, 507
- Trant, Olive, and James Francis Edward, 477, 484
- Triple Alliance, the, 352
- True Law of Free Monarchies*, the, 177
- Turner, Sir James, quoted, 316
- Tyburn, Henrietta Maria at, 230; bodies of the regicides exposed at, 330
- Tyrconnel, Richard Talbot, Earl of, married to Frances Jennings, 389; in Ireland, 419
- Ulster, Plantation of, 218
- Uniformity, Act of, 335
- Union, Treaty of, 463
- Urbino, ducal palace of, assigned to James Francis Edward, 479
- Urquhart Castle, joined to the crown, 51
- Uxbridge, conference at, 271
- Vandeveldes, the two, employed by Charles II., 344
- Verrio Antonio, decorates Windsor Castle, 345
- Vervins, siege of, 383
- Villiers, George, Duke of Buckingham. See Buckingham.
- Vincennes, fortress of, Charles Edward sent to, 527
- Virginia, planting of, 201
- Wade, General, 514, 516
- Walkinshaw, Miss Clementina and Charles II., 529; death, 537
- Wallace, Sir William, 6
- Waller, Edward, annihilation of his army, 267; defeated at Copredy Bridge, 270

- Walter, 1st High Steward, 61
 Walter, 4th High Steward, 6; at Bannockburn, 7; marries Marjory Bruce, 7; death, 8
 Walter, Lucy, and Charles II., 303, 306; retired on a pension, 323; Charles denies that he has been married to her, 364, 398; children, 376
 Walton, English spy, quoted, 484, 485
 Walton, Isaac, quoted, 194
 Warbeck, Perkin, 77-79
 Wardlaw, Bishop, in charge of James I., 27
 Wark Castle, captured, 87
 Waterford, James II. at, 451
 Warwick, Robert Rich, Earl of, in command of the Parliamentary fleet, 302
 Weldon, Sir Anthony, quoted, 192
 Welwood, Anthony, quoted, 342, 343, 346, 347
 Weier, John, writer on witchcraft, 173
 Wemyss Castle, Mary and Darnley at, 129
 West, Dr, English ambassador, 84, 85
 Westminster, Conference at, 153
 Westminster, Abbey of, burial of Mary in, 157; of James VI. and I. in, 217; of Charles II. in, 376
 Westminster Assembly, the, 268
 Westminster Hall, trial of Charles I. in, 284
 Westminster, peace of, 356
 Wharton, the Duke of, 485
 Whicheot, Colonel, governor of Windsor, 294
 Whig Party, beginning of the, 356
 Whitehall, execution of Charles I. at, 287; James II. at, 439; flees from, 440; returns to, 443; retires from, 444
 White Ladies, Charles II. at, 317
 White Mountain, battle of the, 214
 Wightman, General, 481
 Wight, Isle of, Charles I. in, 280; removed from, 284
 Wilmot, Lord, victory of, 267
 Willoughby, Admiral, of the revolted fleet, 302
 Wilson, Arthur, quoted, 192
 Winceby, battle of, 269
 Winchester Palace, 345
 Windsor, James I. at, 30; Charles I. at, 284; burial of Charles I. at, 293; decoration of the castle by Charles II., 345
 Witchcraft, and James VI., 173, 195
 Wogan, Charles, his marriage embassies, 481; rescues the Princess Sobieski, 483
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 83; seeks to entice Beaton to England, 97
 Wood, Sir Andrew, 66, 67, 73
 Wyndham, Mrs, nurse of Charles I., 297; at Bridgewater, 299; in Jersey, 307
 York, Cardinal. See Henry Benedict.
 York, council of peers at, 252; Charles I. at, 263; surrender of, 269
 Young, John, Somerset Herald, quoted, 71, 80
 Young, Peter, tutor of James VI., 160
 Zulestein, agent of William of Orange, 426

THE END.

